

C-11  
BT 1101 .L9213 1872  
Luthardt, Chr. Ernst 1823-  
1902.

Apologetic lectures on the  
saving truths of

v. 2













APOLOGETIC LECTURES  
ON THE  
SAVING TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.



EDINBURGH: PRINTED BY TURNBULL & SPEARS,

FOR

T. AND T. CLARK:

LONDON, . . . . HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, . . . . JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, . . . . C. SCRIBNER AND CO.

# APOLOGETIC LECTURES

ON THE

## SAVING TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

DELIVERED IN LEIPSIC IN THE WINTER OF 1866.

BY

✓  
CHR. ERNST LUTHARDT,

DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY.

SECOND EDITION.

Translated from the Third German Edition by

SOPHIA TAYLOR.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

1872.





## PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

---



IVEN a superficial comparison of the present with the two former editions will show that I have endeavoured, to the best of my ability, to meet the frequently expressed wish for a more thorough treatment of the several doctrinal questions. Some of the criticisms which have been made are based indeed upon a misconception of my design. My purpose was not to enter into each Christian doctrine under all its different aspects, and to consider the various doubts and objections of which each has been the subject, but to give prominence to that chief point of view under which each must be regarded, and from which it must be examined—a process involving the dismissal of subordinate questions and objections. While I have in no wise altered this mode of treatment, I have, so far as was

consistent with it, entered more thoroughly into many subjects, or considered others which I formerly passed over, both in the text and the notes. In the latter, especially, I have taken a nearer view of certain doctrinal questions, and given more complete reference to the Literature of the subjects in question.

It only remains to accompany this work on its reappearance in the world with my best wishes, and to commend it to the blessing of God.

C. E. LUTHARDT.

LEIPZIG, *August* 1870.

## PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

---



THE Lectures which I last winter delivered on the 'Saving Truths of Christianity,' in continuation of my former series of Apologetic Lectures, are here presented, with very few additions and alterations.

I confess that it was not without hesitation that I undertook this work ; for the more sacred and serious the themes I had to discuss, the greater was my responsibility—a responsibility which I have never lost sight of. I have found, also, but little assistance from the works of others, from the fact that these very questions are just those which have been much less treated by apologetical writers, than those more general religious questions which form the subject of my former series. If, however, I may venture to draw a conclusion from the unusual and sustained interest



bestowed upon them, God has not suffered these Lectures to be entirely without success. May they do their work in their present form also.

I have provided these, as well as the former series, with notes, chiefly of a literary and theological character, and designed especially for such as may desire more accurate information concerning the various matters discussed.

This work is sent forth to the world with the prayer, that the blessing which God has so abundantly bestowed on the former series may accompany this also.

C. E. LUTHARDT.

LEIPSIC, *July* 1, 1867.

# CONTENTS.

---

## LECTURE I.

### THE NATURE OF CHRISTIANITY.

PAGE

The Subject—Christianity the Absolute Religion—Heathenism —The Religion of the Old Testament—Christianity, the Fact Jesus Christ—Former Views of Christianity—Christianity, the Certainty of Salvation—Grounds of this Certainty—Means of this Certainty—Faith and Knowledge, . . . . .	17
---	----

## LECTURE II.

### SIN.

Universality of Suffering and Death—Universality of Sin—Origin of Sin—Universality of its Consequences—Internal Discord— Selfishness the Essence of Sin—Impotence of the Will with Respect to Sin—Guilt, . . . . .	43
---	----

## LECTURE III.

### GRACE.

A Remedy Needed—Vanity of Human Remedies—Need of For- giveness—Grace Needed—Grace Certain—Grace Universal—	
---	--

	PAGE
The Operations of Grace, Secret Operations—Education for Grace, . . . . .	78

## LECTURE IV.

### THE GOD-MAN.

The Question of the God-man—The Man, Christ Jesus—His Sinlessness—Jesus Christ, a Miracle—The Son of Man—The Son of God—Confession and Denial of His Divinity—Necessity of the God-man—Possibility of the God-man—Reality of the God-man—The Self-renunciation of the Son of God—The Contrasts of His Life, . . . . .	106
---	-----

## LECTURE V.

### THE WORK OF JESUS CHRIST.

The Three Offices of Christ—The Development of Jesus—His Prophetic Office—His Rejection—His Atoning Sacrifice—Need of Atonement—Substitution ; its Possibility and Reality—Vicarious Suffering—The Last Hours of Christ—The Cross, . . . . .	136
--	-----

## LECTURE VI.

### THE CONCLUSION OF THE WORK OF REDEMPTION— THE TRINITY.

The Resurrection of Christ—Its Reality—The Exaltation of Christ to be the Ruler of the World—The Holy Spirit—The Conclusion of the Work of Redemption—The Trinity—The Possibility of Understanding it—The Trinity of the Divine Revelation—The Trinity of the Divine Nature—Faith in the Trinity, . . . . .	165
---	-----



## LECTURE VII.

### THE CHURCH.

	PAGE
The Church a Fact—Antipathy to the Church—The Intolerance attributed to the Church—The Supposed Superfluity of the Church—The Nature of the Church—The Contrast of Catholicism and Protestantism—Catholicism—Protestantism—The Internal and External Aspects of the Church—Difference and Unity of the Churches, . . . . .	195

## LECTURE VIII.

### HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Estimation of the Old Testament—Origin and Collection of the New Testament Scriptures—Regard paid to Scripture by the Church—Scripture Principle of Protestantism—Universal Importance of Scripture—Religious Importance of Scripture—Necessity of Holy Scripture—Matter of Holy Scripture—The Understanding and Interpretation of Holy Scripture—Inspiration of Holy Scripture—The Certainty of Inspiration—Faith and Criticism—Duty towards Holy Scripture, . . . . .	234
---	-----

## LECTURE IX.

### THE CHURCH'S MEANS OF GRACE.

The Agency of Grace—The two Means of Grace, Word and Sacrament—The Word—Law and Gospel—The Law—The Gospel—Its Essential Matter the Doctrine of Justification by Faith—The Sacraments—The two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper—Baptism—Confirmation—The Lord's Supper, . . . . .	263
--	-----

## LECTURE X.

### THE LAST THINGS.

The Goal of Perfection—Belief in the Immortality of the Soul—Evidence of the Immortality of the Soul—State of	
---	--

the Soul after Death—The Resurrection of the Body—	
The Future of the Church—The Conversion of the Nations—	
The Apostacy—Enmity against the Church—The Victory of	
the Church—The Future of the world—The Last Judgment—	
Eternal Perdition—Eternal Salvation—Retrospect, . . .	291

## NOTES.

NOTES TO LECTURE I., . . . .	319
NOTES TO LECTURE II., . . . .	330
NOTES TO LECTURE III., . . . .	351
NOTES TO LECTURE IV., . . . .	356
NOTES TO LECTURE V., . . . .	370
NOTES TO LECTURE VI., . . . .	382
NOTES TO LECTURE VII., . . . .	389
NOTES TO LECTURE VIII., . . . .	404
NOTES TO LECTURE IX., . . . .	414
NOTES TO LECTURE X., . . . .	418

# APOLOGETIC LECTURES

ON THE

## SAVING TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

---

### LECTURE I.

#### THE NATURE OF CHRISTIANITY.



WHEN I addressed you from this place, a few years since, it was upon *The Fundamental Truths of Christianity*. Starting from those questions of the human heart and intellect which press upon every serious and thinking man, from the contradictions of the moral world, from the enigmas of our whole existence, I showed you how all these demand the living and personal God, and His revelation in Christ Jesus. It is only by the religious view of the world, by Christianity, that these contradictions are reconciled, these questions answered. For it is only by beginning with God that we can understand either the world or ourselves. Hence everything that surrounds us, and we ourselves, are facts which bear testimony to the necessity and the

truth of religious faith. Such is, in few words, a summary of the former course.

The road which we then traversed together led us but to the door of the inner sanctuary. I now invite you to follow me into this sanctuary itself, and to contemplate its holy mysteries. It is not my intention again to speak of the primary foundations of religion, but of Christian truth itself. I shall this time assume a belief in the fundamental propositions of religious faith, and address you as those who are convinced that the God of whom we cannot help thinking, is also the living and personal God, whom we are designed and called to acknowledge, to honour, and to love ; that He has revealed Himself to us, has shown us our highest destination in religion, and that Jesus Christ is His complete and supreme manifestation. It is, then, on *The Saving Truths of Christianity* that I propose to expatiate ; and to explain and justify these will be my present object.

The road on which we shall travel together is narrower than the former—perhaps, too, it is more lonely. Very many who were willing to accompany us on that, may possibly hesitate to follow us now. And yet what I am now about to lay before you is but the necessary consequence of the great general truths which then occupied us.

Those truths come everywhere in contact with human thought and experience. The doctrines which I have now to bring before you move in a much narrower field of observation. Indeed, it is not so



much the connection with human knowledge in general, as the limited nature of this knowledge, which becomes evident from the central station of Christian faith.

I am well aware of the difficulty of my present task, but I undertake it with the hope that God will not deny me His assistance and blessing.

How far I shall succeed in satisfying the requirements of such a subject, I know not ; but whatever may be the weakness of my words, I beg you to believe—and this is the only thing I ask you to take on my word—that the cause itself is far stronger than its advocate.

Christianity was the goal of the former, it is the starting-point of the present course. I shall therefore begin by speaking of *The Nature of Christianity*; and this will form the subject of our first lecture. (1)

And what, then, is Christianity ? It is a world of thoughts, which have been working and fermenting in the minds of men up to the present hour ; it is an all-affecting change of our entire mode of thought and observation ; it is a transformation of our entire social system ; it is a renewal of our inner life ; in short, it is a world of effects, which are matters of daily experience. Wherever we may be, and wherever we may go, we encounter this new world of Christianity, even when we do not recognise it, even when we misconceive or deny it. But, above all, Christianity is *religion*. The Christian religion is the source whence flows that stream of blessings, of which even they who

perhaps oppose or ridicule Christian faith partake. As religion, however, it is connected with all those religions which have preceded it, and that not merely as one of them, but as their truth, their aim, as simply religion. Christianity is the absolute religion—the only true and internally justified religion. Such is the pretension with which it entered the world, and which it constantly maintains. This may, perhaps, be called exclusiveness and intolerance; but it is the intolerance of truth. As soon as truth concedes the possibility of her opposite being also true, she denies herself. As soon as Christianity ceases to declare herself to be the only true religion, she annihilates her power, and denies her right to exist, for she denies her necessity. The old world concluded with the question, What is Truth? The new era began with the saying of Christ, I am the Truth. And this saying is the confession of Christian faith.

The forms which the Christian faith assumes may alter; the human notions by which it seeks to express itself may change—but Christian faith must declare itself to be the unchangeable truth. It must affirm that this truth is the answer to the old questions of human nature, and that all the religions which have been its predecessors were merely preliminary and preparatory, and have found in it their aim and goal. Heathenism was the seeking religion, Judaism the hoping religion; Christianity is the reality of what Heathenism sought, and Judaism hoped for <sup>(2)</sup>

Let us first consider *Heathenism*. <sup>(3)</sup> To seek God

is the origin of all religion—is the truth even of heathenism. For this feeling, this attraction towards God, exists in every man. Man cannot cease from seeking and inquiring after God. No period of history can be mentioned as that in which men began to be religious. At no time, and in no place, have men been found without religion.<sup>(4)</sup> It is the distinctive mark of humanity. Homer delights to call men speaking or inventive beings. He might have called them religious beings; and this would have been entirely in his spirit.<sup>(5)</sup> It is true that individuals may deny all religion, just as individuals may deny all human affection. But these are exceptions. It is as essential to man to be religious, as to love. As man cannot live without his fellow-men, neither can he live without God. Individuals may resolve to renounce all human companionship; but we could not but call this an unnatural resolution. And he who should carry it into execution, would do so at the cost of his own nature, which would be stunted by the process. So, also, an individual might resolve to renounce all communion with God; but this, too, would be an unnatural resolution, to the detriment of his own soul, which would be impoverished and stunted by the experiment. Nor would any one be capable of fully carrying it into execution. As he who seeks solitude carries with him, nevertheless, thoughts of that world and that human society from which he flees into the desert; so does he who wants to know nothing of God, nevertheless bear about with him everywhere thoughts of God, and in-

quiries after Him. We cannot forget God. This inquiry and search after God is the origin of religion, and the truth even of heathenism.

In all its various forms, from the most elevated and refined to the most revolting, it is equally the religious sentiment and the religious craving which impels men to seek after God. Religion is not a mere collection of notions or of external observances. Even when we meet with it in a stunted or distorted form, we still recognise, at least in single features, its proper nature. Religion belongs to no single aspect of the mind, to no single province of the outer life. It is, on the contrary, the chief matter of the whole man and of his whole life, its home is in man's inmost soul, and the realm over which its dominion extends is the entire activity of the life. For religion is, by its very nature, a relation to God, and indeed a personal relation. We are all made by Him and for Him, and are therefore all made and destined for religion. Our "soul thirsteth for God, for the living God." All religions seek Him, and this is the truth of even heathen religions. They do not, indeed, find Him, because they seek amiss. The heathen mind has sought God in the variety of nature, in the stars of heaven and in the powers of earth; but the heart has always aimed at the one God. Religions are polytheistic; but the religious craving is monotheistic. A touch of monotheism runs through the heathen religions, and sometimes finds a touching expression by individual voices. The heart seeks and means God, but the

mind goes astray by the way, it neither finds God Himself, nor attains to a really personal relation to Him.

However beautiful the thoughts, or elevated the words, found in heathen poets and philosophers <sup>(6)</sup> concerning the Deity, they always exhibit a twofold deficiency: they know neither the Creator nor the holy God.

Creator and Creature, God and the world, stand on the same level in their ideas. Either the divinity is the highest product of the great process by which the world and mankind were brought forth, or the world is an emanation of the Divine essence, proceeding from God, much as thoughts or dreams of the night arise involuntarily from the mind. The former is the system of thought peculiar to the Greek, the latter to the Indian mind. By both is the boundary line between the Creator and the creature obliterated. But the consciousness of the distinction between them is the pre-supposition of their fellowship, and they who do not know the Creator, or deny Him, do by this ignorance or denial destroy the very foundation of religion.

But if they know not the Creator, still less do they know *the holy God*. It is after the likeness of sinful man that they have imagined their gods, with the weaknesses and passions of mortals. Where the notion of the divine holiness is wanting, there is wanting also the highest standard of moral judgment, and a superficial morality takes its place. All heathen worship is



a testimony to this ; for nothing but a superficial morality could think of atoning for sin, or propitiating the Deity, by its own works and sacrifices. There is, it is true, a certain elegance of sentiment in the honour rendered by the Greek woman to her goddess, in an offering of fruits and flowers. Such worship might well be imagined acceptable, if there were no such thing as sin. The heathen religions may be religions of beauty ; but they are deficient in moral truth and moral seriousness. I know well that heathen worship has its dark, as well as its bright side. Till far down the stream of time, even till the time of the Roman emperors, human sacrifices were offered. (7) We turn away shuddering from such a worship ; and yet it is founded on a true feeling—the feeling that life is forfeited by sin, and that sin can only be expiated by life. This horrible distortion of truth—what else is it but the cry of the heart seeking after a propitiated God ? Heathenism is the seeking religion ; but it seeks without finding, and without the hope of attaining to God.

*The religion of the Old Testament* is the religion of Hope. The first quality which raises the Old Testament far above heathenism, is faith in God *the Creator*. An atmosphere of Divine majesty, before which the creature is but dust and ashes, pervades the whole of the Old Testament. The Almighty, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, whose throne is Heaven and the earth His footstool, who speaks and it is done, who commands and it stands fast, is exalted



high above all created beings. And the other particular which raises Israel above the heathen world, is the knowledge of the *Divine holiness*. Nowhere else are found such poignant confessions of sin ; among no other nations are heard tones so pathetic as in the penitential psalms of Israel ; <sup>(8)</sup> nowhere else does a like consciousness of the impassable abyss, separating sinful men from the holy God, exist. No human being can bridge it over ; grace alone is able to do this. It is true that the Israelite offered sacrifice, and underwent purifications ; but he well knew that these could not purge his conscience, that they were but symbolic images of inward piety—types of the future. To this *future* was the eye of Israel's hope directed. Upon this future did Israel live. From it was expected the fulfilment of all God's promises, the satisfaction of all the soul's cravings, when God should establish His kingdom on earth, abolish all sin, put an end to all suffering, take into his own hand the government of His people, and uphold the cause of His saints. This is the hope which runs through all the prophecies of the Old Testament. This goal of the future gave a light by which Israel was able to understand the ways of God in history. Among no other people was the notion and consciousness of the Divine Government of the world so strong and vivid, and the soul of this consciousness was the hope of the future, the future of God's kingdom. This future was to commence with the new Covenant which God would make with His people, that perfect covenant which, unlike

the old one, was not to consist in external precepts, but to have its home in the inmost heart, and to be based upon atonement and forgiveness. This was the great prediction of Jeremiah (xxi. 31-34).

Israel was the nation of *hope*, and its religion the religion of hope. The hope of Israel became a fact in Jesus Christ. This is *the essence of Christianity*. Its essence consists not in an idea, not in mere thoughts, but in *a fact*.

About thirty or forty years since, it was thought that the key to the knowledge of the essence of Christianity was found, when it was said to be the highest idea of the reason.

The era of illuminism and rationalism, which reduced the whole essence of Christianity to a scanty history of the wise and virtuous Jesus of Nazareth, and to some general elementary truths concerning God, virtue, and immortality, had preceded this. When the deeper spirit of speculative philosophy revived in the great philosophers of the present century, it declared this to be the most unsatisfactory notion of Christianity that was possible. It affirmed that the deepest thoughts which occupy every thinking mind had been here deposited in the popular form of figurative language, that the thought of thoughts which forms the mystery of Christianity is the unity of God and man, that God is the truth of man, and man the reality of God. To the external contemplation of the understanding, the two are indeed distinct; but to the inner contemplation of the reason they are

one. Man is not merely the finite being he seems to the external senses ; he is rather a manifestation of the Infinite. When man thinks of God, he is thinking of his own higher truth, and thus combining himself into unity with God. This is the highest thought of reason, and this is the meaning of the Christian doctrine of the God-man. Such were the notions then taught by the philosophic schools of Schelling and Hegel. (9)

Well, it is now acknowledged that all this is a total misconception of the proper meaning of Christian doctrine<sup>(10)</sup>, and these notions of the age of philosophy are generally abandoned. We have learned that philosophy is not religion, and that it cannot take the place of religion. But what does modern so-called Protestantism, designating itself as the necessary progress of the religious mind,—what does that self-named liberal or free movement in theology, which has taken upon itself to reconcile Christianity with the knowledge of the age,—what does it put in the place of the philosophical idea ? A religious one, the idea of religious and moral perfection. This, it is now asserted, is the essence of Christianity. It is said to be the Jewish stand-point to adhere to historical facts, which have no signification for our reason. It is declared to have been the Shemitic mind that enriched the world with the miraculous history hitherto known as Christianity. The advances in culture made by the modern mind are said to have done away with miracles, and made belief in them impossible. This

cannot therefore be the essence of Christianity. For Christianity, like all other spheres of mental life, is a product of general mental development, and its truth consists in an idea, the idea of religious and moral perfection. <sup>(11)</sup>

We grant that Christianity has ideas: it is more rich in ideas than the whole body of ancient philosophy; and the thoughts of a Christian are deeper than those of a Plato or an Aristotle. Yet it is not in these, but in a *fact* <sup>(12)</sup>—the fact of the atonement—that the essence of Christianity consists. It is true that this fact is the manifestation of an idea, of God's own eternal idea of salvation. This idea, however, assumed historical reality, for the purpose of saving man. Even this divine idea could not of itself have saved us. It is our salvation only because it became a fact. For sin is a fact, the most potent fact on earth. Now, if a fact is to be done away with, it must be, not by mere ideas, but by facts. But Christianity is the doing away with sin, the Divine answer to human sin. Therefore it is a fact, the fact of atonement. For this alone, this actual atonement, and not an idea, can give us the peace of conscience we are seeking.

Our whole mental life rests upon facts. All here is governed by the mighty facts of history; and why should not religion be so too? All religions appeal to facts, except, indeed, so-called natural religion, which has no existence but in books <sup>(13)</sup>.

The fact constituting the essence of Christianity is

Jesus Christ. His person may be designated as the essence of Christianity; for Christ is related to Christianity in a different manner from that in which Mohammed is related to Mohammedanism. He has not merely an historical, but a religious significance with respect to the religion called after Him; He is not merely its founder, but its subject; He is one with it,—in fact, He is himself Christianity; and He has united it for all time to His person. It is impossible to forget Himself in His cause. In other cases it may often happen, and this is, indeed, the ordinary course of events,—that, in progress of time, a cause gets separated from the person to whom it owes its origin. Gratitude will, indeed, cherish the memory of those who have been the benefactors of mankind; but the time may come when their benefits will be enjoyed and themselves forgotten. For who can be certain of being never forgotten? Jesus Christ will never be forgotten. <sup>(14)</sup> He has made Himself the centre of His religion; and Christendom has in all ages so regarded Him, as the whole history of the Church testifies. All the controversies waged during the course of the Christian centuries, really turn upon the person of Christ. All worship is a glorification of Christ. All church hymns praise Him. Christian art triumphs when she lays at His feet the choicest treasures she possesses, the best she can perform. And if the conflict of our age turns upon the religious significance of Jesus Christ, what is this but another testimony that He is the central point of the Christian



religion, that He has indissolubly united it to His person ?

Christianity being then, not merely an idea but a fact, and that fact Jesus Christ, we proceed to inquire, *wherein the essence of Christianity consists.*

Various ages and Churches have given various answers to this question.

The ancient *Greek Church* considered it to consist in the revelation of the highest truth, the manifestation of absolute reason. The teachers of the Greek Church were nourished on the great poets and philosophers of Greece. Hence their desire to associate these great spirits of antiquity with Jesus Christ, the King of spirits. They saw scintillations of truth dispersed on all sides ; they saw in Christ the Sun of truth, in His teaching the highest philosophy, the absolute reason. Such were the notions of the Greek dogmatists. They express a truth, but not the whole truth.

The *Western Church* inherited that practical turn, that talent for government, which had been manifested by ancient Rome. It affirmed that Christianity had brought into the world the Divine kingdom of grace and life, that this kingdom is in the Church, that Christianity is the Church. He, then, who would partake of the grace of the kingdom, must submit to the ordinances of the Church. Hence, Christian piety is obedience to the Church. We cannot but admire the energy with which Rome secured for Christianity a safe refuge within the Church, during the tempests



of national disturbances in the West. Yet we cannot find in her the full truth and essence of Christianity.

*The Reformation* proceeded from the anxiety of the conscience for salvation—from the heart's craving for assurance. In it was repeated the old question: What must I do to be saved? and the old answer: Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ! It should never be forgotten that such was the origin of the Reformation and of Protestantism, which finds the essence of Christianity to be the salvation of the sinner by Christ Jesus, of which we are assured by faith. It is on this foundation that Protestantism considers the mental supremacy of Christianity over the whole life to rest. For it does not seek to limit the extent of its influences to the inner life of the individual, but extends them to the entire circuit of human life in general. Not, however, by measures of external authority, but by the power of the Spirit, is Christianity to seek to conquer the world, until the opposing spirit of the world shall, at the close of history, yield to the full supremacy of the Christian spirit, in the times of the future kingdom of God. A world-wide position is due to Christianity. But this it can only occupy, because it is the salvation of the sinner, the religion of Divine grace. This is its proper nature.

And this, its essence, is also the seal of its truth. For it is hereby that it as much abases man through the announcement of his sinfulness and ruin, as it elevates him by the declaration of that Divine grace which saves him. No other religion so deeply humbles

man, yet none so truly comforts him, as Christianity. In all others we have but part of these truths; and man is either degraded to the level of the brutes, or made a god. The Gospel is the whole truth; and it is this truth through its preaching of Jesus Christ. For it is this that shows us the greatness of our ruin, through the greatness of the means necessary to remedy it. It shows us how sorely we need salvation, but also that this is offered to us by the grace of God. <sup>(15)</sup>

Christianity, then, is, on the one side, the salvation of sinners in Christ Jesus; on the other, the faith which assures us hereof. For faith requires assurance. Theology may sometimes be occupied with doubtful opinions and views, but faith requires certainty; and it is its nature to do so.

*Upon what, then, does this certainty depend?* It may be answered: Upon the authority of the Church. And this is the answer of the Romish Church, which affirms: What the Church teaches is true, for the Church is infallible; she has the spirit of truth, she is inspired. But what if she is not infallible? What if she be not free from error? if she have erred? if these assertions fail when tested by the facts of history? What would then be the consequence? Then, faith must fall together with the Church's infallibility; for it rests upon her authority, and is, in truth, faith in her. This, then, cannot be the ultimate foundation of faith. We must go a step farther backwards than the Church.

Behind the Church stands Holy Scripture. Does our faith, then, rest upon Holy Scripture? Well, we believe, and are sure, that in Scripture we have the Word of God, that it teaches us the way of salvation, and is a safe guide to heaven. And yet, can Scripture be the ultimate foundation of our religious faith, and of our certainty? How, then, if certain individual errors be pointed out, certain contradictions shown us, in Scripture, to which we know not how to reply? If we are made uncertain about single books of Holy Scripture, and become perplexed about them; would our faith itself also become uncertain, should we be perplexed about Christianity? By no means. The letter of Scripture cannot be the ultimate foundation of our faith. Our faith is not mere faith in Scripture, but, above and beyond this, in the matter of which Scripture informs us. And this matter, if we would name it by one word, is Jesus Christ. We believe in Jesus Christ, not merely on account of Scripture; for rather do we believe in Scripture on account of Jesus Christ. It is true that it is the Christ of Scripture, and none other, in whom we believe. But we believe in Him on His own account.

This faith is not a merely historical, but a religious one. There are historical truths, and there are moral and religious truths. We can only be certain of historical truths in historical ways; other truths are matters of internal conviction. That Cæsar was killed by Brutus, that Napoleon I. died at St Helena—these

are historical truths. No well-informed, no intelligent man doubts these facts. But what have they to do with our inner life? And who would hazard his life for them? They are casual historical facts, without significance for our inner life. We are certain of them; but this is only an historical certainty—no inward assurance, no moral conviction. That Jesus lived; that He was born during the reign of Augustus and of Herod; that He died under Pontius Pilate, etc.,—these, too, are historical truths, of which we are certain in an historical manner. But they are not of merely historical, but of religious importance to our faith. It is this religious importance which is the peculiar matter of our faith. The history of Jesus Christ is the history of our redemption. The facts of His life are to us truths for our inner life. These require an inward assurance. Of these we have not merely an historical but a moral conviction. Of historical truths we become certain in a historical, of moral truths in a moral way. The essential truths of Christianity are, by reason of their importance with regard to our inner religious life, raised to the dignity of moral truths. The ultimate proof of all such truths is their self-evidencing power—their internal evidence to the conscience and reason, and the external proof of their moral effects. This internal evidence of Christianity is two-fold. Our spirit bears testimony to the spirit of truth which speaks to us, and this spirit of truth bears testimony to our spirit. For it is our heart which testifies that this Christ, His death and resur-

rection, is just what we are seeking and needing; and again in proportion as we receive into our heart the testimony of Jesus Christ, does it prove itself an inward power of life and knowledge to us, and thus bear testimony of its truth to our heart.

Such is the religious certainty of faith. *How, then, do we arrive at this certainty?* Not by the way of evidence, but of inward experience.

We do, indeed, bring forward arguments for the truth of Christianity. We deliver apologetic lectures. But what do all these effect? They may indeed refute and do away with the assertions of unbelief; they may remove the stumbling-blocks which lie in the way of faith; but they cannot create the inward certainty of faith itself. Faith is not the result of arguments. If faith were a mere victory gained over the understanding by means of arguments, it would be without moral worth and significance. But it is a moral act. I can so demonstrate a geometrical proposition, that the understanding of another is obliged to accept it. I can compel another to acknowledge the truth of the Pythagorean proposition, if he only possesses sufficient understanding to follow the process of proof. But who will say that this concession is of any moral importance to man? It is the necessary act of his reason, not the free choice of his will. We attain certainty either by means of the conviction of the senses, or by means of the operations of the reason; but the former are of no avail, and the latter totally insufficient in the case of moral truths. And equally



is this the case in matters of faith. For here it is not the reason only which speaks, but the heart and conscience also. Faith is the act of the whole man, and hence it comes to pass, not merely by an act of the understanding, but by a vital process, in which the whole man concurs. It is not a matter of demonstration, but of inward experience.

I may talk never so much of the beauty of colour to a blind man, whose eyes have never beheld the light—it will be but a foreign language to him. Not till his eyes are opened will he understand my words, will he be in a condition to judge of the colours of the light. And so is it in the present case. If our eyes are closed to the world of God's light and truth, this world of faith, no talking, no proofs will avail. I can get so far as to feel my want, to desire light; but I shall not see and understand it till my eyes are opened to behold it. It is a vital process by which I attain to the knowledge of faith. As we only know of this world in which we live, because we were born into and live in it; so can we only know of that world of faith when we are born into and live in it. And as we have direct and unquestionable certainty about this world in which we are placed, because it is matter of experience; so are we directly and unquestionably certain of that other world of faith, when it also becomes matter of experience. For, as surely as we have experience of this world, may we also have experience of that. As truly as the world of sense comes in contact with us, and enters into our minds, so truly does the invisible



world come in contact with us, and enter into our minds. And thus we attain to the certainty of faith.

But can there be certainty of faith, and is there such a thing as knowledge in matters of faith? Are not faith and knowledge opposed to each other? So it is said. Allow me, then, to speak to you, for a few moments, of the mutual relations of knowledge and faith.

Both from the stand-point of knowledge and that of faith, have knowledge and faith been pronounced incompatible. It is denied that knowledge can be reconciled with faith, because knowledge takes nothing for granted while faith takes for granted what it believes. It is denied that faith can be reconciled with knowledge, because it is by its very nature a matter of feeling and emotion, and resists knowledge. And yet each requires the other. Knowledge requires faith as its postulate, for all knowledge is based on faith; and faith requires knowledge as its consummation, for faith is already a kind of knowledge and presses onwards to knowledge. God has referred each to the other and connected each with the other, and what God has joined together, let not man put asunder.

Is there any knowledge which takes nothing for granted? Is not every science based upon ultimate axioms, which are matters of direct certainty, *i.e.*, of faith? And are not the world and the perceptive mind of man the presuppositions of all knowledge?

I can have just as much certainty of the existence of the world which I do not see, as I have of this

world which I do see. If there is a world of eternal goodness and truth, and if we are created for it 'and not only for this transitory world, we must be as susceptible of the former as the latter, and as capable of observation and inward experience with respect to the one as the other. It is upon this that the certainty of faith depends. Or will it be said that faith is no certainty, but only a subjective or arbitrary notion? On the contrary, it is no less a certainty than other certainties—it does not differ from these in degree but only in kind. The certainty of faith comes to pass and is exercised in another way, and that way is neither the conviction of the senses nor demonstration to the reason, but moral conviction, *i.e.*, faith. Are we certain only about that world which is the object of our five senses, or about the world of mathematics, and not about the higher world of the moral spirit? Are we not certain of the existence of God? That God exists is as certain to us as that we ourselves, or the things that we see and feel, exist, or that two and two make four. Nay, far more so; for the latter might be a delusion, but God can be no delusion. One of the greatest mathematicians, the philosopher Cartesius, said: 'The existence of God is more certain than the most incontestible geometrical proof. But this is a certainty of faith. Certainly if we are to know God we must believe in Him. Certainty of God's existence is indeed knowledge, but it is the knowledge of faith. I must believe that God is, for I do not see him; but I do believe in Him, for I ex-

perience Him. As surely as I am certain of what I see, so surely am I also certain, through faith, of what I do not see. Faith is a certain confidence of what is hoped for, and doubts not of that which is not seen' (Heb. xi. 1).\* Faith concerns the invisible world. But the invisible world is no less a reality than this visible one; we belong to it as much as to that which is the object of our senses; and we are in effect as truly in contact with the former, and thereby as certain of its existence, as is the case with respect to the latter. We have but to raise our mind towards it; and it is faith which gives wings to the mind and carries it into that eternal world, in which it becomes by faith as much at home as in this visible one. But that invisible world can be understood only according to its own nature and its own laws. They who mentally transfer this world to that, and measure and judge thereof by such a standard, will never comprehend it. But where are we bidden to make this world the standard of the eternal world? Everything has its own laws, and must be measured by its own standard. The laws of mathematics do not avail to explain the freedom of the will; nor can the standard of this world avail to furnish a conception of the eternal world, which must be measured by its own standard. When Darius, pressed by Alexander the Great, sued for peace, and offered him the half of his empire, Alexander's friend, Parmenio, exclaimed: 'Were I Alexander, I would

\* 'Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.'—*A. V.*

accept it.' 'So would I,' replied Alexander, 'were I Parmenio.' The act of Alexander surpassed the notions of Parmenio, and he would need to raise his mind to the level of Alexander's to understand it. The present case is a similar one. For what is any greatness to which human conception can attain, in comparison with God and the world of God? It far surpasses our notions, and must be judged by its own standard. But when our mind is raised to the height of that eternal world, it can understand it. It is not our reason, not our powers of thought, not our knowledge, that must be laid aside; it is only this world which must be expelled from our ideas, if we would mentally soar to the other. It is faith which gives wings to the mind.

Can it be that faith is so irreconcilable with enlightened thought, that Jacobi was right when he said that he was in heart a Christian, but in head a heathen because the consistent conclusions of sober reason opposed what his heart accepted by faith? In that case, faith would certainly be confined to sentimental or poetical natures, and dispensed with by clear heads and logical reasoners. But what kind of faith would that be which should depend on certain natural dispositions? Truly a faith of no great value. And what kind of life, too, would that be which should bear within itself so irreconcilable a schism, which should have cravings of the heart entirely opposed to the demands of the thinking head? But this is not the case. Faith is not merely unenlightened feeling, nor religion merely a matter for the sentimental. Faith

is the firm and joyful certainty of the heart which knows what it believes. Faith is not the opposite of knowledge, but the highest kind of knowledge, which is more worth being known than any other. Those who believe and those who know, are not so opposed that the former belong to one, the latter to another party, and that they must be forsaking the world of faith who are advancing towards knowledge. A man does not cease to be a believer because he becomes a scholar. Does our knowledge of God dispense with our believing in Him? Nay, we only know Him in proportion as we believe in Him. What else do we know of the grace of God in Christ Jesus, but what we believe? All our religious knowledge depends on, and requires faith, and faith again requires knowledge. In the same degree as faith becomes the vital principle of the will, does it become the reasoning principle of the mind. For faith includes both. It is a fact of the inner life, and it is a conviction of the mind; and hence it begets both life and knowledge; for it is as much an intellectual faculty as a moral power, though one which is exercised within the world of faith. It is true that as the moral life of faith is limited by the weakness of our nature, and never reaches on earth its full and due development, so too do the finite categories in which our reasoning powers move, set limits to the full and due knowledge of faith;—limits which we shall not be able to surmount till we are also delivered from the limitations of our moral attainments. When our faith has become sight, the antinomies,

which our knowledge that is of faith, can never be free from in this world, will cease. But as moral life incessantly struggles, notwithstanding its consciousness of limitation, towards the goal of perfection, so also does the reason of the Christian strive to promote to an ever-increasing degree of fulness, the knowledge of the mysteries of faith.


It is in this sense that I impose upon myself the task of endeavouring in the following lectures to bring before you the truths of Christian faith. These truths form that sanctuary within which the reasoning powers of the Christian man are exercised. When we enter it, let us do so with that reverence with which we enter one of those mighty fanes whose very stones speak of the mysteries of the kingdom of God.

Eternal Grace has erected the majestic edifice of a Divinely revealed redemption, over the abyss of sin. It is upon man's sin and God's grace that the kingdom of God is founded. The first of these will form the subject of my next lecture.



## LECTURE II.

### SIN.

IN and grace are the two great facts about which the whole system of Christian doctrine revolves. He who understands human sin and Divine grace, understands Christianity; for it is upon these that Christianity depends. <sup>(1)</sup>

I am to-day to address you upon *Sin*, Sorrow, and Guilt. These three vital powers are intimately connected.

We cannot think of sin without our mind being occupied with all the sorrow and suffering under which mankind has been groaning during the course of the ages.

It is true there are moments in which the sensation of these vanishes—moments of pure joy and pleasurable existence, in which the whole wide world appears as bright and beautiful as though no shadow of mourning had ever passed across either it or our own souls. But in such moments we are occupied with what seems, not with what is: we are but forgetting the sorrows of life, they have not therefore departed from the earth. When we descend from those heights from

which the world appeared so bright and fair, to the realities of life, we find them full of pain, sorrow, and misery.

It is said that there is peace in nature. But this is not true. Heraclitus, an ancient and profound philosopher, called strife the father of all things ; and the observation of nature teaches us that the same conflict, the same cruelty, prevail here as in human life. The destructive forces are incessantly at work ; and he whose mind is absorbed in such contemplations, might well doubt the wisdom and goodness of God.<sup>(2)</sup> The Apostle Paul depicts, in affecting language, how even the irrational creation groaneth and travaileth for a future redemption (Rom. viii. 19).

If it be objected that we are but transferring to nature the feelings of our own souls, this is, nevertheless, an admission that such feelings are in us, and that, therefore, evil is a universal fact in human nature. As long as men have lived upon earth, ever since they began to think, the question concerning the origin of evil has exercised their minds. Whence comes evil ? Whence comes pain ? It may be said that all religions, especially the most ancient and profound, are attempts at a satisfactory solution of this problem. The most ancient philosophy is the Indian philosophy of the Vedas. Their theme is the fact of evil. The most widely-spread religion is that of Buddha. Its origin is the sorrow of earthly existence. The latest philosophy of our age is that of Schopenhauer, the solitary philosopher of Frankfort. His mind is constantly

exercised with the question of evil. Leibnitz laid down the doctrine of the best world. Schopenhauer calls this a bitter contempt for the numberless sufferings of human nature. The theme of his philosophy is the sorrow of life. <sup>(3)</sup> But whatever we may think of the various schemes of philosophy, and the various religions, the fact is at least certain, and this is sufficient for our purpose, that our life is the path to death.

Witnesses to the *dominion of death* surround us on all sides. A constant dying, which touches the feelings of all, is ever taking place throughout *the realm of nature*. Those religions of the ancient world, which were deifications of nature, held funeral lamentations when the glories of spring disappeared, over the deceased favourite of the gods and of men. What was it but dying nature that they mourned? <sup>(4)</sup>

Our feelings on this subject are not so vivid as theirs were, in those days of old; yet we are not able wholly to banish the feeling of melancholy from our minds; and the poets of our own times are ever singing dirges on the perishableness of earthly things: ‘*Vergänglichheit wie rauschen deine Wellen!*’\*

But it is not the realm of nature alone which is subject to this law of death. We see it bearing rule also over that of *history*. What now remains of the magnificent works of man in past ages? A few ruins, a little dust, the sport of the winds. It is amidst the rubbish-heaps of the desert that the researches of

\* ‘Perishableness, how do thy waves roar!’

scholars into the history of the great empires of antiquity have to be carried on. We are everywhere treading upon the dust of the past.

And ourselves, however prosperous and happy our life may have been, however long it may have lasted—an instant, and it is extinct. And what remains even of the most fortunate? A handful of dust, moistened with a few tears. Such is our end. We, too, are passing away.

But we pass away not merely like the fading flower or the unreasoning animal. We know that we die, and that we have to go through the sensation of dying; and not of dying alone, but of the many tortures by which it is often accompanied. We celebrate the heroes who have died for their country upon the field of battle; but who knows the horrors, the unspeakable horrors of a battle-field, which are covered by the veil of night, or illumined by the rays of the morrow's sun? Nor is what the eye can see the most dreadful of these horrors; there is, besides, the secret suffering, the dumb despair, which perhaps seeks death as a deliverance from insupportable anguish! And who counts the tears of the bereaved, or takes cognisance of the desolated families, and their ruined happiness? But we need not tread the bloody field of battle to become acquainted with death. It is everywhere in our path, every day tells us, and every departure from life announces to us what death is.

And it is not merely the bare act of death. Dying is not a single act, but a process—a process reaching

through the whole life. Our life is a continual dying ; it is nothing but a delayed death. Our whole life is a life of pain, whether of mind or body. The life of one may be less painful than that of another, but none is absolutely free from pain. A life without pain would be a life without love, for love is sympathy. Poetry is the mirror of life. Suppose all the sorrow were taken away from poetry, what would remain ? All true poetry is full of sadness, for life is full of sadness.

Proudhon, the socialist, called his system, *La Philosophie de la Misère*. Socialism and Communism may be dreams, but they are founded upon a postulate which is no dream, but a reality—the reality of human woe. The triumph of modern Christianity is the inner mission ; and what else is this great and blessed work, but a conflict with manifold suffering ? Yet, on the whole, an impotent conflict ; for suffering is the mightier, and often what heart-rending suffering,—that of the poor, the forsaken, the proscribed, the fallen ? If any one could take in at a single glance the whole sum of human misery which surrounds him, and feel at once all the pity which such misery demands, I believe he would die of it, for it surpasses computation. <sup>(5)</sup>

Are we to say that this is a right state of things ? Such an assertion is at variance with the deepest feeling of our hearts. The ancients called death the brother of sleep, and as such they often depicted it. This was, however, but an attempt to veil its terrors

under a poetic figure, for the mind is not really delivered from them by such means. Schelling, in his beautiful Dialogue "Clara," represents death as the liberation of a higher germ of life which lies hidden in man. <sup>(6)</sup> It is true that we have an immortal guest in the perishing tabernacle of the body. But the breaking up of this tabernacle is the most violent and painful act of life, and every one feels that this way of deliverance is an unnatural one. Our nature would not so struggle against it in the agonies of death, if it were in agreement therewith. Death is a rupture running through our whole being and dissolving the harmony of our life. And does not the whole realm of nature which is external to us exhibit the same image of a destroyed harmony? Our feelings involuntarily associate this sway of death with sin. The testimony of conscience bids us seek the reason of this discord of life, in the discord existing in the moral world. It is God's justice that has made death the companion of sin. It is the moral laws of nature that have connected the one with the other. The reason why the discords of creation around us, touch us so powerfully is, that we feel them to be images of our moral condition. And it is the consciousness of this connection which gives to suffering its full poignancy. Hence, if I omitted to speak of the *moral* evil which meets us in so many and so various forms, I should be forgetting the most essential feature in the picture of human woe.

Society is engaged in a continual warfare with a



determined and dangerous foe, over which it never obtains complete mastery,—and that is *crime*. There are times and circumstances in which it raises its head more boldly than at others ; but at no time does it wholly cease to be a terror to the well-disposed, and a temptation to the abandoned. Its forms are various ; for manifold are the passions which slumber in the human breast and break forth in acts of malice, in the rapacity of avarice, in the fever of lust. There are individual crimes, and there are national crimes. There are histories of single families and of races pursued by the curse of crime ; and there is the history of the human race, everywhere marked by crime. And if we confine ourselves to the narrowest circles,—how many crimes does even one of our great and brilliant cities enclose ! how many does one single night cover with the veil of darkness ! (7)

It is said, in reply, that these are but single ulcers in the body of humanity ? Well ; do not these testify that the humours of the body are corrupt ? We may not be the criminals, but the criminals are our own flesh and blood. They show, at least, how deeply human nature can sink, of what it is capable. It would be impossible it should act thus unless it were already fallen. There would be no crime if there were no sin.

Sin is, moreover, a universal power. To prove that it is such, is surely like pouring water into the sea. The poets and thinkers of all ages describe and lament its dominion. (8) All religions have been occupied with the question of sin, of its origin, of its abolition.

The human mind has ever been proposing to itself the inquiry, Whence is evil? The answer furnished by Christianity is the simplest and the only possible one. For if we say God made man sinful, we deny both His holiness and His love; and if we say that moral purity is the goal of man, but not his starting-point, we attribute to God the principle which the Apostle Paul condemns: Let us do evil that good may come. Sin is not original. Many treatises have been written on the origin of evil, but not one on the origin of good. And why is this, but because it is involuntarily taken for granted that good is one with the origin itself.<sup>(9)</sup> Therefore, sin and sorrow are not original, but took place as events.

*How then did sin come to pass?* Is it a necessary product of our *sensuous* nature? Such is the assertion of Rationalism; but an erroneous one. No one, indeed, can mistake the power of sensuousness. We all feel it. Fleshly lusts overthrew the old world, and are still destroying very many. They form one great province of sin; but not its whole domain. Arrogance, ambition, pride, self-righteousness, egotism, are not sins of the flesh. The roots of sin penetrate more deeply than to the mere body and its members: it is a spiritual power, dwelling no less in our minds than in our bodies; it is the perversion of our will; it belongs to our moral, not to our physical nature, otherwise our conflict with it would be not a moral but a physical one. But however we may ill-use our bodies we do not thereby destroy sin; nay, even if we kill ourselves we do not thereby kill sin, since we cannot kill the soul. Sin does not arise from the senses.

Does it, then, spring from our *finiteness*? Are we sinful because we are imperfect beings, because we are creatures and not God? Such has been the teaching of philosophers such as Jacobi, and such is the meaning of the ordinary language which finds an excuse for sin in the weakness of human nature. How then? Must I needs be God to be sinless? We long for deliverance from this most ignoble bondage, and we hope that the time of our freedom from it will come. But even in eternity we shall remain finite creatures. In what does our moral perfection consist? In loving God with the whole heart, and bearing His image and likeness. It is not, then, our finiteness but our sinfulness which is our hindrance in this matter; it is not because we are creatures, but because we are fallen creatures, that we cannot attain to it. Sin does not originate from our finite nature.

*Is it, then, a necessary law of human existence?* the inevitable opposition in the path to perfection? So does the school of Hegel teach. All life,—it is said, consists in contrasts, in yea and nay: and so also does moral life. Yea and nay is bad theology, says Shakespeare. Sin is that which ought not to exist; it cannot, therefore, be necessary. Let its necessity be ever so ingeniously proved, our conscience will ever deny it. Sin is not the highway to good, but the opposite of good; evil is not the shadow of good, but its opponent; and good is not, as it were, the parent of evil, but its judge. Proud words have indeed been spoken, and the assertion made, that man did not come to the consciousness of his freedom, nor become

man, in the full sense of the term, till the first sin. Even Schiller fell into this error, and the school of Hegel hailed it as wisdom. <sup>(10)</sup> But sin is not the exaltation of man, but his fall, not the dignity of man, but his disgrace. It does not raise him from the animal to the human being, but lowers him from the man to the brute. It is an act of his freedom, but it is its abuse. And it is in these words that we find an answer to the inquiry after the origin of evil. It is the abuse of freedom. Freedom is essential to human nature. It embraces the possibility of opposition to God. But this possibility is not necessity. By an act of his freedom, man made this possibility a reality. Freedom was the gift of God ; but the abuse of freedom was the deed of man. <sup>(11)</sup> Scripture declares that man suffered himself to be seduced into disobedience to God, into desires for forbidden enjoyments ; that he thus became sinful and radically corrupt ? Is this so strange ? On the contrary, does not this, and this alone, solve the problem of sin, and explain the fact of human corruption ? <sup>(12)</sup>

The remembrance, more or less obscure, of a fall at the beginning of history, survives among all nations. We everywhere meet with legends of a better state in the early days of our race, with echoes of the Scripture narrative of a temptation from without, and of a yielding thereto on the part of man, entailing fatal consequences on the race of man and his earthly abode. <sup>(13)</sup> They are but obscure and confused reminiscences, that have been preserved in the memories

of the various nations; yet they are reminiscences, and when compared with the account given in Scripture, we easily perceive how they serve to confirm it. The unadorned simplicity of the Biblical account plainly testifies that the tradition here deposited, is the source of all the traditions which have, in their course through the various countries and tribes, sometimes taken so fantastic a form. Even ancient philosophy bears similar testimony, after its fashion. Plato speaks of remembrances which the soul bears within her,—remembrances of original higher intuitions of celestial beauty, the echoes of which, during this dark earthly existence, accompany her in the mysterious depths of her inner life, and are raised to consciousness as soon as the certain word is uttered by which those slumbering ideas are awakened. He has but transferred to the individual man that which applies to the whole race; for we certainly all bear within us, so to speak, the memory of a lost home. We feel like exiles, longing for the native land from which they have been driven; a craving for a better future, a home-sickness for a lost home, everywhere accompanies us. In old age it often takes the form of a melancholy regret for the days of childhood. Yet this is, in truth, not a regret for the days of our individual childhood, but for the childhood of the race. Whatever of good or noble human nature may bear within it, its ideas of the good, its moral efforts, its higher, nobler feelings, are the ruins of a past greatness. We are all walking among such ruins. They are



bearing testimony to what has been ; and we involuntarily receive their testimony. Man is neither an angel nor an animal, but a fallen child of God ; and he feels his fall. He has at least preserved remembrances of his dignity. It is true that he now goes about, as it were, in rags ; but, beggar as he is, he once wore a crown. It is evident that he was born a king. Is it to be wondered at that he should long to recover his crown ? <sup>(14)</sup>

When Scripture thus depicts the first beginning of our race as a state of happy innocence, it gives expression to a feeling which is universal, and which deeper reflection confirms. The rude barbarism and brutal vice found among heathen nations of the lowest grade, are not remnants of primitive nature, but unnatural states of subsequent degradation brought about as events. Rousseau's dream of uncorrupted nature is nowhere found to exist. Everywhere do we meet, whether in language, customs, or legends, with fragments of a higher mental level, but they are fragments, as it were, of a ruined world. This primitive condition was something more than a merely natural state, for the soul of it was the relation of man to God. For man is not a merely natural being, but a moral personality, and his supreme destiny is communion with God. Communion with God, *i.e.*, religion, is so intrinsically part of the nature of man, that we cannot but own that when man is unfaithful to it, he is unfaithful to himself. When God conceived the idea of man, he included in the image of man his communion with God as its most essential and distinctive feature. And



if the creation of man was the realization of this idea, God did not create him without forming a bond of communion between Himself and man, and filling man's reason and will with His presence. All man's affections had God for their object and aim. An involuntary attraction, like that which draws a child to its mother, drew his heart to God. But it was just this involuntary attraction of the heart which was to be raised to an act of conscious will, and elevated from the sphere of nature to the sphere of freedom. The gift involved a duty. The path to its fulfilment led through the gateway of free choice. Man had not yet reached the goal of his destination, but he was on the way to this goal. His holiness was not yet the holiness of achievement, but it was the holiness of innocence. In like manner he had not yet received full immortality, though he was free from death. He bore within him the possibility, but not the actuality of sin and death. If both have now become realities, this came to pass by the act of man, by the decision of his will—in other words, man fell.

Sin is an affair of the will; it belongs to the sphere of the intellectual and moral life, and, consequently, to that of liberty. We are not obliged to sin, but we choose to sin; it is an act. But it is not merely an act, it is a quality of the will, which produces acts of sin; it is a state which precedes acts. It was an act, then, which produced this quality, and placed us in this state. It was by this primary act that we became *sinful*.

It is objected that the history of the fall of man is

a history which is always repeating itself. Assuredly this is the case. But it does not follow that it did not occur at the beginning, because it has occurred again and again. On the contrary, it repeats itself, just because it did then take place, and thus become a fact of our nature. Hence the Scripture narrative of the fall is no philosophical myth clad in the garment of history, but an account of a fact ; for sin is a fact requiring a historical origin, and not a mere idea, indigenous in philosophy. Undoubtedly the narrative is full of symbolism, but it is the symbolism of history. Does it excite wonder that, according to the Biblical account, God Himself seems to have given an occasion to sin ? If, however, it was necessary for man to exercise his power of choice, a trial was needed under which he might maintain his obedience to the will of God, and attain the goal of freedom in this path of obedience and self-restraint. Or is the childishness and seeming externality of the occurrence, as there related, a stumbling-block ? We reply, was it not by these very qualities suited to that primitive condition of the first-created of mankind, in which the spiritual life was not yet so separate from the sensuous existence as is the case with ourselves ? Besides, who bids us confine ourselves to the external features of the occurrence ? Are not these, in all cases, the transparent covering of those internal transactions in which our moral nature makes its far-reaching decisions ? In this case it was the relation of the heart to God which was decided by the choice made, and it

is in this circumstance that its fatal importance consists. The sinful act of the first-created human beings went through three stages. The first was disbelief of God's love. The prohibition enjoined them seemed to them an arbitrary denial of a desirable good, and an obstacle to their freedom instead of an assistance on the road thereto. With faith in God, moreover, love to Him also disappeared, and the tendency of their heart towards God was first checked, and then turned in a contrary direction. This was the first stage. Man then put himself in the place of God. He took his lot into his own hand, and purposed, in his arrogant self-exaltation, to look for the future to his own powers for happiness. He desired, as if he had been his own creator, to be what he wished to be through himself alone. He forgot that God was his origin, and therefore his end, and made himself, in his proud self-seeking, the end and aim of his life. And to this the second was also added the third stage, that of sensuous gratification in the world, of which he thus became the slave instead of the king. Unbelief, pride, and sensuous pleasure,—such is the threefold perversion of man's threefold relation to God, to himself, and to the world,—the threefold dissolution of his original harmony, upon which depended his holiness, his life, and his happiness. It is in these three fundamental forms that sin first appeared, and that we still meet with it in the history of the human mind. These are the three great historical forms of Rationalism, Pantheism, and Materialism. For the

soul of Rationalism is unbelief, that of Pantheism pride, and that of Materialism sensuousness. These have their roots in the occurrence which is related in Scripture, and the dominion which they exercise confirms what our own experience daily tells us, that we all became sinful through that decisive act which took place at the beginning.

But we are not merely sinful, we are also capable of redemption. We may be saved, we are to be saved. We are not absolutely lost, for we are not absolutely in unison with sin. We may be freed from it. It is not one with our nature; it did not arise from our nature; it came to us from without. We are seduced beings, beings who fell through seduction. It is a comfort to know that we have been thus seduced and led astray, for in this fact lies the possibility of our deliverance. The primary source of sin is beyond, and not within us. There must, then, be a sinful power beyond and above us, through whose seduction we became sinful. It is not the power of bad example; for whence did this bad example itself originate? It is not a mere tendency of the human mind; for whence did it arise? It is not the mere power of events; for how did events attain this power? Sin appertains to the sphere of liberty, not of necessity, for it appertains to the mind and the will. The primary source of sin must therefore lie in a free and spiritual power, and in its free act, whereby it made its will a sinful one. Scripture calls this spiritual power of evil the enemy of God, or Satan.

No other doctrine has encountered such decided aversion as that of the existence of the evil spirit. It is said to be an impossible because a self-contradictory doctrine. But if we admit the existence of spirits at all, why should there not be also evil spirits? Or do we regard the existence of spirits as impossible? It is taught by Scripture, which calls them angels, *i.e.*, messengers, from their office of servants of God, messengers who do his commandments; or spirits after their own nature, because they are incorporeal; or dominions and powers, because of their super-human properties. This is a view which Scripture shares in common with other religions. And the very fact that it is a primeval and general notion with all nations ought to excite a prejudice in its favour. It is true that modern consciousness differs from that of ancient times. We put the powers and laws of nature in the place of spirits. But as there are between man and inanimate nature natural beings, is not the notion of spiritual beings between man and God the absolute spirit, forming as it were a bridge between the two, one which obviously suggests itself? And does not a somewhat similar notion obtrude itself on modern consciousness in the current language used concerning the more exalted beings with whom it peoples the starry worlds, for the sake of opposing a counterpoise of spirit to the ascendancy of matter? The only difference is that while this notion assigns to these higher beings a merely mechanical position with regard to man, Scripture gives them a relation to man, and



thus makes them an essential element of the one organism of the universe. And rightly so; for man, as the union of spirit and nature, as the mean between God and the corporeal world, forms the bond and therefore the centre of creation; and hence Scripture does not scruple to place these spiritual powers of heaven in the service of man. For man is, according to Scripture, the object of Divine Providence, and these spirits subserve its ends. They do not take the place of Providence, but they are its instruments. Neither do they take the place of the powers and laws of nature—natural science can explain the phenomena of nature without the intervention of spirits—but they are the means of connection between the whole sphere of natural life with its individual phenomena and effects and the kingdom of God, of which man is the object. In this teleological view lies the superiority of the Scriptural representation of spirits over the ordinary and popular one. And hereby also is this notion justified and its moral truth affirmed. <sup>(15)</sup>

As far, then, as spirits are possible at all, so far are evil spirits also conceivable. For the world of spirits as well as that of man is a world of moral decisions.

If this world of nature and history, which is the object of our senses, has a deeper background leading beyond the boundary of merely human existence, must we not also demand a similar one for the wide realm of evil as we meet with it in history? For what else is history but a conflict between the two powers of good and evil? It is this moral contrast which makes



the spectacle of history so touching. As surely as good has its history so too has evil its history. A consistency and an intelligence prevail throughout this history which is not the production of evil individuals, but which these more often unconsciously than consciously subserve. There is a hidden spiritual intelligence guiding its threads and combining them into a connected web of falsehood and sin. In like manner we speak of a kingdom of evil as well as of a kingdom of good. But it would be blasphemy to say that the former must be as directly referred to God as the latter. Does not its consideration, then, constrain us by an intrinsic necessity to accept the notion of a spiritual power in whose hands the several threads of evil meet? And does not our own experience bring this notion home to us? For who has not found, often in his holiest moments, in his most sacred seasons, thoughts of an evil and seductive kind arise, of which he could not but say that their original source was not within himself? We all experience again and again that we have to fight not merely with flesh and blood, but with a mysterious world of evil powers, whose operations extend to our very hearts.

It is true that this view has, especially in earlier times, been perverted to superstition and fanaticism, and is even to the present day abused, being sometimes made by men the ready excuse for sins which are their own. Such abuse may serve to explain the prejudice felt against this notion, but does not justify it. And all else that is objected against it is of no

great importance. When it is asserted that a supreme degree of moral depravity and spiritual intelligence cannot be conceived of as united in one subject, or that the ever-renewed experience of the futility of every attempt to oppose the cause of God must at last put an end to such attempts, we reply that both these objections are refuted by experience, which both presents us with such a union of depravity and intelligence, and shews that the very futility of attempts always provokes fresh, though ever so hopeless trials. Such objections, however, are by no means the true motive for the rejection of this doctrine. This lies at a far greater depth below the surface, and is in reality a disinclination to the seriousness of the moral view expressed in it. For if sin is not merely a manifestation of the weakness of our nature, and the simple act of our will, but if its ultimate roots lie in a mysterious spiritual world of evil, and place us in connection therewith, then sin and its danger, as well as the task of contending against it, appear far greater and more arduous than when we conceive of it as disconnected from such an origin and connection. It is the levity of our nature and the shallowness of our usual way of thinking which revolt against this doctrine and find it gloomy and dismal. But when rightly considered, we cannot but say, that it is some comfort to think that not in ourselves, but in that world of spirits, lie the ultimate cause and real principle of sin. For the distinction between human and diabolical sin is this, that man does not commit sin for its own sake, but for the

sake of the supposed good with which sin illudes and thus deceives him, on which account Scripture so often speaks of the "deceitfulness of sin." The characteristic of diabolical sin, on the contrary, is to do evil out of a love for evil itself. How this radically evil will was attained is shrouded in obscurity. Scripture gives us only some slight intimations on this point, by giving us to understand that the desire for the government of the world drew the subject spirit, and after him all who were like-minded with him, from his relation of service to God, and placed him in opposition to Him and to His good and gracious purposes towards man. The last word of the enigma, however, we shall never be able to discover. Here our knowledge has limits, because our experience has its limits. Enough for us to know that there is a power of evil outside the sphere of human will and human faculties, and that they yield to its dominion who yield to the dominion of sin; that our sin knits bands of communication with the kingdom of evil and with the hostile power of evil, and that it is the shadow of this dark power which has fallen upon our souls. <sup>(16)</sup>

When man fell, it was through this power,—he fell seduced, but in a state of freedom. It was an act of obedience to his seducer; but it was an act of his free will that he renounced obedience to God. And it was a fatal act.

*Its consequences* have reached to all. The destiny of all of us was decided by the act of our progenitor,

for it was not merely the act of an individual, but that of the representative of the entire race. Hence it was not merely of individual, but of universal import. It is reckoned the act of us all, for we all form one great unity. Each is mysteriously interwoven with the whole. No one can isolate himself therefrom, and say: What does it concern me? Whether we understand it or not, whether we acknowledge or resist it, it is yet a fact that the fatal consequences of that first act extend to us all. It has the force of a joint debt, resting upon the whole race of mortals. Nor are we insensible to the fact. Poets express their conviction of it; the asceticism of the penitent is an expression of the feeling that human life is infected with guilt; and sacrifices have been offered not merely for individual acts of sin, but for the guilt of the whole race. If you call this thought a gloomy one, you thus, at least, confess that it is a true one. But let us not forget that there is not merely an act of sin, which is the act of all, but also an act of redemption, which was effected for all.

We all experience the consequences of this act by *that power of sin* which we bear within us. No one can deny it. No one is really good by nature. Rousseau, indeed, maintains that we are so, and founds upon this notion, his ideas concerning the reformation of society. But his own life refuted his maxim, and he must but ill have known human nature and his own heart, who knew not what dark spirits inhabit the human breast. (17)

We have lost our unity with ourselves—the harmony of our nature. A deep discord runs through our whole being—a discord between the judgment and the will, between the will and the power. This inward schism in our nature constitutes our unhappiness. In modern times it is greater than ever, for Christianity has done away with the times of ignorance, and made it impossible for us to be deceived about ourselves. Its light has penetrated the dark abysses of our nature. And if we do not let this painful knowledge heal us, it makes us only the more unhappy.

Let us now cast a glance over one province of intellectual life—that of modern poetry.

The tone of this internal rent runs through the whole body of modern lyric poetry, from Byron down to Heine. Poetry has been regarded as a power which glorifies and redeems life, as a power which can take the place of religion and the Gospel. But what we hear from the mouths of modern poets is a heart-piercing wail over the pain caused by this schism. And this wail is not something merely got up; it is truth. It is not the utterance of a morbid temperament, but testimony to a deep-rooted disease. The disease of our soul is, that it has lost God. <sup>(18)</sup>

For that which makes man so unhappy, is his separation from God. God should be our all in all, and it is in Him only that we can be happy,—in Him we find the harmony of our being, and He is the true centre of our life. <sup>(19)</sup> But the sin of man is, that he makes himself the centre of his thoughts and wishes,



—that he refers everything to himself, and shuts himself up in himself. ‘I am myself alone.’ This saying of Shakespeare’s Richard III., this inherent fault, is the confession of sin.

Wherein consists the essence of sin is a question which has at all times been discussed. No more correct answer can be given than that it consists in selfishness. If the essence of virtue consists in the love of God,—in the surrender of self to the God of holiness and love,—the essence of sin consists in refusing God that love of the heart for which we were made, and which is our happiness, and in placing self in God’s place, and making it the idol of our thoughts and desires. It is true that human sin, as it meets our view does not always appear in the guise of selfishness, but seems, on the contrary, a mere perversion of the affections. Man makes choice of perishable possessions and pleasures, and seeks therein the satisfaction of his heart and the happiness of his existence. The feature of love remains, but it has gone astray,—it has turned aside to vanity, instead of being drawn out towards eternal possessions, and the highest of all possessions, even God Himself. If, however, we will be quite honest with ourselves, we must own that the perishing possessions of this world with which we seek to allay the ever-gnawing hunger and thirst of our souls, even the fellow-mortals whom we often so passionately love, are after all, but the means, not the end. It is not they whom we love; it is ourselves that we love and seek in them. Even the most pas-



sionate love, nay, that especially, is but selfishness. It is ourselves that are the central objects of our wills in all that we desire. We make self and its satisfaction the ultimate aim of our life, our thoughts, our wishes. It is this which constitutes the essence of sin. We may often be unconscious of it, we may be deceived about ourselves, we may esteem ourselves more unselfish than we are; but even, though unconsciously, selfishness really lies at the root of all sin; and when sin appears in its true colours, it appears as selfishness. The magnates of the kingdom of sin have been the magnates of selfishness.

Certainly it is not our vocation to deny or to annihilate our personal self. How should man be capable of the everlasting love of the Holy God, if he were not a personality, if he were not a self? It is for this very cause that we are personal,—that we may love God, receive Him into ourselves, and be filled with Him. He is to be the centre of our whole existence, the end of all our powers of thought and will. This is holy self-love. But secretly to alienate ourselves from Him, to banish Him from our hearts and put self in His place, so as no longer to love Him before all things, and ourselves for Him, but ourselves above all things, and all things for ourselves,—this is the sin of selfishness. We are made for God; hence our nature finds its unity, its peace, its happiness in Him. Without Him we are in a state of unhappiness and discord,—we have lost our unity and peace. <sup>(20)</sup>

For we are made to find in God the satisfaction of

our moral nature. We cannot find it in ourselves ; we are unhappy in ourselves alone. We love, yet flee from ourselves, and are not happy in our own society. Even the daring one whom Shakespeare depicts cannot bear being alone ; he flees from and hates himself. And one needs not be a Richard III. to experience a like feeling.

The word of the age is Humanity, *i.e.*, harmonious human nature. It is quite true that the harmony of our nature is the duty enjoined us. But is it our attainment ? It has never yet been attained, and least of all in the present times. It has often been said that our age resembles that of the Roman Cæsars. I, too, think it does. Well ; the historian of that age was, as you know, Tacitus. And whoever is acquainted with his writings knows what an expression of contempt for human nature plays about his mouth. I have often observed that contempt for human nature increases just in proportion as knowledge of human nature does. Talk of harmonious human nature ! Certainly, we shall not know peace till we have found the moral harmony of our nature. But how shall we attain it ? Is our very disharmony to bring forth harmony from its own bosom ? Only God can bestow it upon us, for He is the end for which we are destined, and in Him our nature finds its unity and peace.

Truly man is a marvellous being. Nothing is more powerful than man ; and yet what are we ? Slaves of death,—slaves of sin. We bear about within us a discord, and cannot get free from it. We know the

good, yet choose it not ; and even when we do choose it, we do it not. Such is the affecting complaint of the Apostle Paul, which finds an echo in thousands of hearts. <sup>(21)</sup>

We boast of the power of the will. I would be the last to underrate it, for we need to have the will strengthened and not discouraged. But does our will really possess within itself the strength to free itself from the power of sin ? It has ever been one special offence of Christian doctrine, that it maintains that man is of himself incapable of good. This is called underrating man, and offending against his dignity. Certainly, if Christianity can be no other way justified than by an undue depreciation of human nature, we would rather renounce all attempts to justify it. But we are not depreciating but exalting human nature, for we do not content ourselves with a low standard of morality, but lay down the very highest ; we set before man the highest moral aim, for it was for this that he was created. They who teach him to be satisfied with a lower degree of morality, and to find therein the ultimate aim of his efforts, are they who really degrade and depreciate him. Truly, if we know no higher moral standard than the ordinary integrity of social life, man is capable of attaining to it. And yet—who is there that has never lied ? Who that has never detected himself in words or acts of cowardice in his calling ? But even if not—is this all ? Is this the whole duty of man ? They who aim no higher than this are the true depreciators of men. This all ?

—to do no harm, not even to do good, still less to be good !

We are capable of self-control. But *self-control* neither changes our inclinations nor purifies our heart. It would be but a scanty morality which should go no further than self-government. We may subject ourselves to the command of moral law, but this subjection is not that free consent of the will to the law, wherein alone true morality consists. For a morality which is the result of constraint, though of a constraint which we impose upon ourselves, is no morality at all in the strict sense of the word. Morality is to be found only where there is freedom—true freedom of will ; not the victory of duty over inclination, but the free consent of inclination to duty. True morality is love. Kant founds morality upon the commands of duty, but leaves no room in his system for love ; and naturally so, for everything can be commanded but love. It is the freest of all things, and yet it alone is true morality. ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength ; and thy neighbour as thyself.’ Such is morality, as the Holy Scriptures and the Church understand it. And it is of this that we say that man is not able of his own power to perform it. It is beyond his power. We can feel our inward obligation, we can bitterly lament the chains of the sin which is nevertheless dear to us, we can seek freedom and long for it, but we cannot make ourselves free, for we cannot fundamentally alter our nature. However

much we may do that is good, this doing will not make us to be really good. Who is capable of uprooting selfishness from his own breast? <sup>(22)</sup>

In thus speaking, we are not lowering man,—nay, we are but directing him to his highest aim,—but we are establishing a fact. And this fact is the power of sin, from which we can only be delivered by an operation of Divine power.

But sin is not merely a power which has dominion over us; it is also *our guilt*. It is not mere suffering which we endure, evil which we have to bear; it is our own free act for which we are responsible, for which our conscience makes us responsible; it is guilt.

The attempt has lately been made to do away with the whole question of sin upon statistical grounds. <sup>(23)</sup> It has been thought possible to prove that, even in the most apparently free, in the most arbitrary acts, a certain conformity to law and order prevails within the sphere of moral action in human society in general. Hence, it is inferred, that a natural law and not the free determination of the will, is paramount in this matter. This conformity to law has been especially pointed to in the case of suicide. Its numbers show a certain equality of fluctuation, and, in their distribution among the various races and countries, manifest a variety which is, on the whole, constant. But does it follow that this act ceases therefore to be one of free choice? It only follows that there are certain predisposing causes of this act which make it cease to be a purely arbitrary one, and that these causes, whether

they lie in external circumstances or natural dispositions, are variously distributed. But responsibility does not cease, because the decision of the will is influenced by these causes. How long has freedom meant groundless and arbitrary action? It was noticed, to adduce an example, that in the year 1847 considerably fewer marriages took place than usual. And why? Because the high price of corn, and its various consequences, made the establishment of a home more than usually difficult. This was a matter for the consideration of the individual. But did his decision therefore cease to be a free act? And the case in point is similar. In criminal acts, the ultimate decision does not depend upon external circumstances, but upon the moral quality of the will, its degree of moral strength or weakness, and the liability to temptation occasioned thereby; and these fall under the moral sentence of responsibility. It is true that this moral quality itself is not independent of those external circumstances in which the man is placed, often against his will, and that even the power of temptation, which external circumstances exercise upon our seducible nature, is a varying one. But what follows? That the course of human affairs is not merely the work of our will, but that it is guided by a higher hand. God did not relinquish the guidance of the threads of history when He allowed us to sit with Him at the loom of time, and to furnish the woof in the fabric of the Divine government. How the two—the Divine guidance and human freedom—



are to be reconciled, who can pretend to explain ? This is that great problem of history which we shall never be fully capable of solving. It is enough for us to know that the one does not abolish the other. Human freedom is not destroyed by the fact that conformity to law prevails in human affairs ; nor does it follow that the spontaneity of the human will ceases because God governs the world. The one is a fact as well as the other. Whether we understand or not how the two combine, the fact itself does not depend upon our understanding it. We bear within us the consciousness of our responsibility ; and this consciousness is as much a fact as any other, and is as certain to our reason, through the inward experience we have of it, as all the figures of statistics, which can never persuade us that we are not responsible for the decisions of our will.

Again, our consciousness of responsibility rests upon our consciousness of the moral contrast between good and evil. No sophism can ever talk us out of this, or make us believe that good and bad are alike.

There is a modern movement—prevalent especially in France, but having also disciples among ourselves—which abolishes the standard of our moral judgment. And yet this standard is the highest, and that which is most worthy of man. In its place is put the understanding of motives and of connection. That which appears evil to us, it is said, appears so only if we isolate it, and regard it independently. To understand all is to justify all ; all is right because it is. But what does

such a theory lead to? To a judgment according to results; for then what succeeds is moral, what fails is immoral. This is not merely preaching the logic of facts, but also the absolute justification of facts. There could then be no more crimes in history; the moral feeling would have no right to revolt, and the conscience would be condemned to silence. The end would be, moreover, the homage of mere power; and Nero would be quite as good as St. Paul, and the horrors of the French Revolution as its noblest victims. Such a view of history is that of a slave, who knows no higher authority than that of his master: it gives the lie to our moral sense, and denies all that is best in our nature. Ignoble temptations, mean thoughts and emotions, at times flash through us all. Are we to place these on a level with our noblest feelings and resolves? Would not this be offering the greatest insult to ourselves? Then repentance would be a folly, for nothing would any longer be wrong. So long, however, as there is a conscience in the world, it will protest against such doctrine; and so long as goodness is loved, crime will be hated. Nor shall we ever cease to use the terms good and evil, virtue and vice, morality and sin, honour and disgrace, as contrasts; these can never become the obsolete expressions of a past age.<sup>(24)</sup>

As long as we distinguish between good and evil, so long shall we esteem the evil which we will or do as guilt; for if all other judges are silent, there is one who will not be silent—our conscience! Its accusations pursue every sinner, embitter his life, and turn his joy into sorrow.

There is preserved in Tacitus the commencement of a letter addressed by the Emperor Tiberius to the Roman senate. <sup>(25)</sup> Nothing can be more melancholy than its words. But that which dictated this melancholy language was a guilt-burdened conscience. It is this which does execution, even before sentence is passed. It seems as if there were certain seasons when the sense of guilt and of the Divine wrath revive with special energy. The heathen author Plutarch wrote a separate treatise 'On the Fear of the Gods,' in which he depicts, in affecting terms, the anxiety of mind and the fear of the Divine wrath, which, in his days, took possession of many, and rendered their lives unhappy. The Flagellants of the Middle Ages, amounting, both in Northern Italy and Germany, during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, to many thousands, who went about practising their horrible penance, are examples, though morbid ones, of a sense of guilt in a state of active excitement. <sup>(26)</sup> But the feeling itself is independent of the change of times and of their tendencies. For the moral sense is independent of these, and is part of the nature of man. Its strength and truth are the standard for the moral truth of man. This is the point at which God begins His work of deliverance in man; and here, too, is that place of inward torture which can become a hell to him.

The poets have exhausted themselves in the most mournful descriptions of the unhappiness of a guilty conscience. The Roman Satirist Juvenal emulates in this matter the Greek tragedians, and Shakespeare's

Richard III. and Macbeth are affecting witnesses to the power of this inward accuser. Take up Lenau ; you find everywhere this complaint, and the vain longing for forgetfulness. Turn to the pages of Platen ; his description of a guilty man is one of his most affecting poems. And when Goethe, in his ' Wilhelm Meister,' makes the old harper sing one of his lays, its subject is the unhappiness of the guilty. <sup>(27)</sup>

And who is free from guilt ? Nowhere is life without guilt, for nowhere is it without fault. When the great dramatists, whether heathen or Christian, place before us a picture of the intricacy of human destiny, it is ever guilt which ties the knots. A guiltless hero would be no hero for a drama. And what is this but to say that life's battle is never without guilt ? It is the heritage of all mortals, for we have all sinned in manifold ways, and have all sinned against God. It is His holy justice which pronounces us guilty, and its sentence finds an echo in our own conscience. This it is which constitutes the heaviest burden of guilt ; this which bows us down : this which paralyses our activity. It is folly to say that the way of guilt is the way of freedom, as we read in certain poets and philosophers. There is nothing which weighs with such crippling effect upon the moral activity as a guilty conscience. <sup>(28)</sup> Only a free conscience can add joy to effort ; and he who would conquer the future must be cleansed from the past. Guilt paralyses, because it makes us unhappy.

There is much which makes us unhappy, but nothing

more so than guilt ; for, many as are the ills of life, none is greater than this. We may lament over other things, but there is nothing so really lamentable as guilt. And yet what avails lamentation when there is no deliverance? Yes, if we are referred to ourselves, there is none ; but if there is a God, there must be a remedy. Our feeling of our misery, our lamentation over our sinfulness, is a power which draws down a remedy from Heaven. And this remedy is nothing else than Grace.

## LECTURE III.

### GRACE.



OTH Christians and non-Christians are agreed that this world is a world of woe. But if this is all we can say, it were best to cover our heads and lay us down to die; for then there is but one means of deliverance, and that is death. Christ, however, began His Sermon on the Mount by declaring that the poor, the suffering, the mourning, are blessed. Those whom we call unhappy He calls blessed, 'for they shall be comforted.'

My hearers, the light of life is not happiness, but comfort. To be happy, in the ordinary sense of the word, can no more be the lot of all than to be rich. It is utterly vain to torment oneself with thinking why this should be. God has so ordained it; and we have to accommodate ourselves thereto, whether we understand it or not. For who is there that can be called thoroughly happy; '*Es ist kein Menschen leben ohne Wunden.*' \* (1)

What is called happiness is not really happiness. True happiness is comfort; and this happiness is for all.

'Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be

\* There is no human life without wounds.



comforted.' God alone has the right to utter such words in a world of sorrow, for He alone has wherewith to comfort the sorrowing. It is grace alone which can afford consolation.

Or are we beforehand to disclaim all comfort? Much as such resignation may be preached, the doctrine will never find a believing audience. Let any one who is unhappy be ever so eloquently exhorted not to feel himself unhappy, it would be much the same as telling the hungry man not to feel his hunger. Our souls were made for happiness. But how is the unhappy to feel happiness in the midst of his unhappiness? The light of life is not happiness, but comfort, because this is true happiness. But this God alone can give.

Is it said: Time brings comfort. Time comforts no one; it does but blunt the feelings, or make us forget; and this is the soul's weakness, not her strength. The thing really needed, is not to forget, and yet to be comforted. And of this time is incapable.

Is it said: We must look at the whole bearing of events; the contemplation of this will console the sorrows of the individual; for even if individuals suffer, the profit of the many compensates for all? Such statistics are incapable of comforting a single sorrowing soul, as one trial will sufficiently prove.<sup>(2)</sup>

Once more, are we referred to the progress of mankind? The course of history is truly one of constant advance, in spite of sorrow, sin, and guilt. But progress is, we feel, too dearly purchased at the expense of individual misery; and it would be too dearly bought

at the price of the moral ruin of a single soul. One soul is worth more than the progress in culture of the whole race.

What then, do we want? We want deliverance from sin, and atonement for guilt. Only grace can deliver us, and it alone can provide us an atonement.

Can we *deliver ourselves*? Ancient philosophy had a certain degree of acquaintance with the moral burden of life. The ways which it took were various, but the end it had in view was ever the same—man must deliver himself. The old world was wrecked in this attempt at self-deliverance.

And can we, from our own resources, point to anything beyond what it possessed? What is to help us? Nature? We are often referred to Nature. Here, it is said, we shall get peace; upon her bosom we shall become pure and peaceful, and regain the child-like disposition which we have lost. But Nature herself has no disposition; she does but borrow ours. She can bestow no peace which we do not bring with us. Only the voices which a man hears within him resound from without. Lenau journeyed to North America, to find there the rest and peace which he could not find in Europe; but the primæval forests of America whispered to him of nothing but the mystery of death.<sup>(3)</sup>

It is not Nature which can help us. Is it, then, culture? 'When the rose is degenerate,'—it is somewhere said,—'other thorns may be made to grow on it, but still thorns.' Culture may change our manners, but it cannot free us from our sins; it can refine, but

not improve us ; it can make us clever, but not pious. The dominion of the basest passions may be combined with the highest degree of mental culture.

A redeeming and ennobling power has often been attributed to art. It has been said that what gives religion its power over mind, is the art which is present in religion. Schiller endeavoured to correct the moral rigorism of Kant by æsthetics. And how often have similar notions been heard from modern authors ? I may perhaps be allowed to reckon myself among the lovers of art. But that art can be our saviour, I am constrained to deny : nor does she herself make any such pretension. Art, indeed, stands in alliance with religion, but cannot be her substitute, nor does she desire this. She lends her garment to religion, and extends a helping hand to her operations, but does not take the place of religion and morality. And if we ask the question of artists themselves, they will acknowledge that they have to carry on the same conflict with the power of sin within them as others, and that in this conflict they are not helped by their art, but by the moral power of religion ! If Platen, in his sonnet to Winklemann, idolises art, I suppose the authority of a Michael Angelo outweighs his ; and what he thought upon the subject, he has more than once expressed in his poems. Form and colour,—says he, in his sonnet to Vasari,—cannot give true peace to the mind ; it seeks that love which stretched out its arms on the cross to lift us up.<sup>(4)</sup>

Or are we to seek deliverance, not out of, but in

ourselves, in our own spirit, in our will, in our reason ? We saw, in our last lecture, what the will is capable of. Self-control is not deliverance from sin, and law is not liberty.<sup>(5)</sup> Duty does not strengthen our moral power, nor change the inclinations of our heart. And so long as virtue is not indigenious here, what is it worth ?

*Self-deliverance* and *self-help*, by means of philosophic notions, have of late been especially dwelt upon.<sup>(6)</sup> Spinoza's pantheistic doctrine, that the individual is but a ray of the universal light—a single drop in the ocean of the universe—has been revived. A drop rises from the ever-tossing ocean, is for a second—called seventy years—illuminated and transparent, and then the drop sinks again.' Hence the individual should view himself in the whole ; ' only in the whole is there reconciliation.' But this is the kind of consolation with which ' a dying flower ' might be comforted, but not a human being. It may be very well for merely natural objects, but not for a personal being. It might suffice for creatures subject to natural law, but not for man who has a conscience. This teaching is none other than the wisdom of Buddha. But if Buddha had taught all that could possibly be known, Christianity would not have been needed. It is not intellectual progress to return to the dreams of India, which history, in its progress to what is now the order of the day, has left behind. Christianity, and not the doctrine of Sakjamuni, is now the order of the day. If the latter is to prevail, let us openly say, with Leopold Schefer, that the last hope is universal ruin ; make Freiligrath's

‘Anno Domini’—that sad lay of the annihilation of all things—our confession of faith; and, with Feuerbach, celebrate death as our God. Let them who look upon such doctrine as the comfort which we want, do so; but let them know that they understand neither human nature nor themselves.

There is no such thing as ‘self-deliverance.’ We can no more deliver ourselves, than forgive our own sins. The grace we need is not only delivering, but *forgiving* and *atoning* grace; for all sin is a transgression against God. Against whomsoever it may have been committed, this always holds good: ‘Against Thee only have I sinned.’ It is true that each single sin is the transgression of a single command. But he who transgresses one command is guilty of the whole law. For the whole moral law is present in each single command, and the whole is violated in each; because the law is not a summary of individual precepts, but is formed into a whole by a unifying principle. And this is the will of God—His will, His holiness, Himself it is which makes a command to be a command, and a part of the law. He is Himself present in each. Every transgression against the command is a transgression against God Himself. And as the law is a unity, so also is man a unity. The whole man, his whole will, his whole heart, his whole sin, is active in each separate energy which manifests its activity in this or that sinful act. (7) Every sin makes man guilty, and guilty, moreover, before God. Hence, it is only God who can forgive our sin.



Can we make reparation for our sins? What is done cannot be undone. And, however pious we may be, and however many good works we may do, we do but perform our present duty, and cannot thereby cancel the accusations of the past. A sinful life cannot be blotted out by the godly life which may follow it. Let us not deceive ourselves. No good work can annul committed sin—forgiveness alone can do it. Neither can any penance I may impose upon myself effect it. If I have grievously offended against any one,—against his love, his confidence,—I may do penance for this by a life of the greatest self-denial; yet I shall not get peace until I have humbled myself before Him, and asked and received His pardon. Nothing but pardon can annul transgression. Our guilt needs forgiveness. <sup>(8)</sup> But we cannot forgive ourselves. Only He against whom we have sinned can do this—*only God*; for against Him only have we sinned. Not till we have heard from His mouth the word forgiveness, have received the distinct and certain assurance of pardon, can we know the peace of guiltlessness.

We all need God's grace.

We should need it even if we were not sinful; for nothing but God and His grace can bring us to the goal of our natural destination. And what is this? To be vessels, into which God pours the life of his love; temples in which the Spirit of God dwells. As the flower turns to the sun and unfolds itself, as the plant cannot flourish nor develop itself without light,



so do we all seek and need by nature the light and life of God. We cannot come to perfection without Him. God must descend into us ; we must receive Him into ourselves. He tends towards us ; we tend towards Him. Our whole being reaches forth towards Him, longs for Him, lives upon Him. It is for this that we are made ; it is this which is our destination. To withdraw within ourselves is sin ; to open our hearts, to expand them, that we may receive into them the life of God, is our true destination. Man's highest dignity is his capacity for receiving God ; his highest aim, communion with God. And it is this even by nature.

This is true, even of the life of natural intellectual endowment,—much more of the life of the soul, and of our will. Even the intellectual endowments we possess are the free gift of God—are grace. Is it because of his deserts that God makes any man a vessel of His gifts and of His Spirit,—that He deposits in the mind of a Goethe, the poetic echo of the world of nature,—in that of a Schiller, a longing after the world of the ideal,—that He diffuses among the gifted spirits of our race, the eternal ideas of the true, the good, and the beautiful, and uses them for the manifestation of His Divine majesty ? And are these highly gifted ones the sole recipients of God's gifts ? Has he not given in every soul the echo of His rich world ? Is not our inmost heart like a harp touched by His finger ? We all, one as well as another, have an inward perception, in various manners and degrees,

of the tones of the world's great harmonies, and in them of the praise of the Almighty. And who will speak of merit in this matter? But God has not made us recipients of the revelations of His power and wisdom only. There is also a constant communication going on between eternal love and us. We experience His love in our lives, we feel it in our hearts, we live upon it. That we know God, that we long for Him, that we bear Him within us, that we find in Him the goal of our destination, is the free gift of God,—is favour, *i.e.*, grace. That which is best even in our natural life is free gift and favour. We can earn much, but not what is best. We may earn thanks, but not love; this is never earned,—it is always freely bestowed. And so also is it with God's love. Even if we were not sinners, we should have to speak of grace.

But we are sinners!

It is the highest attribute of royalty to exercise grace. <sup>(9)</sup> Grace sits enthroned above the sceptre of justice; it forms the top-stone of the whole edifice of human society. Justice is its foundation, but grace is its crown. We cannot dispense with grace in human society. How, then, in our communion with God? '*Wir beten all um Gnade.*'\* Our daily prayer is, or ought to be, Forgive us our trespasses. Long as this world has existed, there has been but One who needed not to bring this petition to the throne of grace; for He alone was without guilt. But He taught us thus

\* We all pray for grace.

to pray, and thus prayed for us: 'Father, forgive them.' We all need forgiveness.

Even in our intercourse with each other we need mutual forgiveness. No true and heartfelt communion among men is possible without mutual and repeated forgiveness; for we all offend against each other, even if it be only in thought, in harsh thoughts and unloving judgments. And at certain seasons, when this specially presses upon the mind,—at least when the last farewell, the farewell to life, is at hand,—we are constrained once more to seek our loved ones with our eyes, to stretch out our hands towards them, and to say,—the departing to the survivors, and the survivors to the departing,—'Forgive,' that the burden may be taken from our conscience. How then? Have we no need of forgiveness with respect to God, against whom we are daily, nay, hourly offending, if in nothing else, if neither by word or deed, yet at least in this, that we do not love Him as we ought, and as His eternal love deserves? Not until this wall of separation which has placed itself between Him and us, this debt of sin which severs us from God, these accusations of conscience which keep us at a distance from Him, are done away with, can we draw near to Him, or He to us. We all need forgiveness.

Or would we, perhaps, like the Roman poet, wrap ourselves in the mantle of our own virtue? It would be a very tattered garment. How should we appear before God in it? However persuaded we may be of our own excellence, however filled therewith, that

man must have stifled all feeling of truth with respect to himself, and be wholly immersed in self-complacency, who does not feel, at least at times, that his sins press upon his conscience, and make him uneasy. We can suppress these stirrings of conscience, but we are then offending against our moral feeling, and blunting our inward susceptibility for moral truth. And even if we succeed in silencing, during the whole course of our life, the witness to truth which is within us,—when we are on the point of passing into another world, that world of naked truth where there is no more self-delusion, and where all mere seeming disappears,—then, at least, what we thought long ago buried, revives, and long-vanished scenes and times come again before the mind, and raise their accusing voices against us. And he who has not yet entirely stifled his moral sense, will then at least humble himself under the conviction of his sins, and seek forgiveness.

Is this beneath us? Is it a dishonour to man to seek the pardoning grace of God? They whose pride desires to receive only what their deeds deserve, will receive sentence of condemnation: since however meritorious our works may be in man's eyes, they are worthless in God's, if the soul of all good, the free love of God, be absent from them; for God looks at the heart, and not at the external act. The least act may in His eyes be the greatest, and the greatest the least, according as it is or is not a work of the heart's unselfish love; for this is true morality. But this is just the thing which by nature we have not; and in its

place we are ruled by selfishness. If, then, we would be rewarded according to our merits, we shall have nothing to receive, and less than nothing. We need grace. Shall we say that this is unworthy of a free man? Let us put the question to our natural moral consciousness! Which is the more honour to a man—to own a fault, if he has committed one, or to deny it? If he owns it, do we not acknowledge him again as one morally cleansed, and renew our moral union with him, as standing on the same moral level as ourselves? But if he denies it, are we not inwardly repelled? do we not despise instead of esteem him? does not his pride disgrace instead of honour him, because it is untrue? and does not the separation which his fault has made between him and us, become a lasting one? And how much more is this the case with respect to God? To seek the grace of God does not dishonour, but exalt us, and is as worthy of the man as of the woman. The greatest men have ever been the humblest. It is true, the pre-Christian ages knew nothing of this humility. They were even unacquainted with the word. It is Christianity which has made humility the first of virtues, the chief jewel in the crown of Christian graces, and the soul of the Christian life. Was ever man more truly manly than St Paul? I know of none. At all events, none ever laboured more abundantly, and our continent knows of no greater benefactor. Yet, if we would express his inmost heart, and the deepest feeling of his soul, we could but utter the word grace. He was pre-eminently

the preacher of grace, and the consciousness of grace was the soul of his life. 'By the grace of God, I am what I am.' Among mortals, I know of none whom I could compare, for humility, with those two humblest of all highly favoured beings: the Virgin Mary and the Apostle Paul. It was humility that made the one capable of the greatest suffering, and the other of the greatest work. The humility which bows to grace is as much the strength of the man, as it is the ornament of the woman.

I do not know that a prouder inscription was ever written concerning any man, than that placed under the statue of Copernicus at Thorn: '*Terræ motor, solis cælique stator.*' But the words of Christian humility, on his monument in St John's church, in the same town, do him far more honour: 'I crave not the favour which Paul received, nor the grace with which Thou didst pardon Peter; I only pray for that which Thou didst bestow from the cross upon the thief.'

Since, then, we all need grace,—since it is *indispensable* to each of us,—may we depend upon finding it? Permit me in the next place, to speak of the *certainty* of grace.

The utmost limit which our thoughts and contemplations can reach, is the will of God. In the will of God lie the roots of our earthly life; from it arises the stream of earthly history. All that is seen points to an unseen world beyond itself. It is there that we must find an answer to the questions of this earthly life; for all that takes place in this visible world has



its origin in that. The eternal thoughts of God, and the counsels of His will, form the hidden background of the visible history of the world of man.

What then is this will of God ?

The highest thought which we can conceive or utter of God, is that He is eternal love. God is power, and the creation of the world is a monument of His power. It is equally admirable, whether directing our glance towards immeasurable distance, we are at last constrained to pause before infinity ; or observing the wonders crowded in the smallest space, we are forced to confess that even our instruments of highest power are incapable of distinguishing their infinite abundance. But His love is higher than His power. Love is the ruler ; power but the servant. Love is the first and last thought of God, which power does but execute. Love is the proper nature of God, as all His revelations announce,—that special mystery of God, first fully disclosed to us by Christianity. God is Love, self-imparting, condescending, sympathising love. And the aim of Love is communion with man, the communion of our souls with God, who is eternal Love. The purpose of creation is love. When God created the earth he manifested his glory, but the purpose of his heart was man. It is the pre-eminent excellence of the scriptural view of nature to comprise the whole world into a unity at the head of which is the One God, its creator. The oriental mind lost itself in an intoxicating feeling for nature, while the Greek mind saw in nature the foundation for man ; with Scripture, however, the

whole universe is but a theatre for the manifestation of God. This thought makes it possible to Scripture to combine into one single image what is even most heterogeneous and furthest removed, in a manner quite unparalleled in the heathen view of the world. In this sense it is that Humboldt, in his *Cosmos*, bestows such great admiration upon the 104th psalm.<sup>(10)</sup> But every manifestation of the power and wisdom of God is but preliminary to the manifestation of His goodness, and all the rich abundance and intricacy of nature is but the vestibule of the moral life of man, whose vocation it is to unite the world with God and to promote, by his service, the kingdom of God. 'What is man, that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou visitest him? For Thou hast made him but a little lower than God,\* and hast crowned him with glory and honour, Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands, Thou hast put all things under his feet. Oh, Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth!' <sup>(11)</sup> If God is well pleased with His creation it is because He is well pleased with man. It is man's destiny to belong, in joyful and reverent love, not to himself but to God, and it is his highest honour to be permitted to serve Him. The highest and ever recurring wish of the pious psalmists of the Old Testament is, that sin may be extirpated from God's glorious world, which it has defiled, and that this world may become the holy and happy kingdom of God. This is the end of

\* Than the Angels, A. V.

all God's ways, the object He purposed in creation. We cannot understand creation till we view it in the light of His eternal love and its counsel.

But if love is the purpose of creation, it is no less the secret of Providence. The notion of a Providence was impressed even upon the Heathen mind, though it was but in a hesitating and imperfect manner that it ventured to entertain such a thought. Not till the revelation of salvation was given to man in Holy Scripture, did this doctrine of Providence attain to full certainty, not till then were we taught to extend it even to our slightest concerns. For then we were taught to know God as love, and His will as a will of all-embracing love.

Whatever exists or happens forms part of a great system of means and ends. The greatest is connected with the least, the nearest with the most distant; but one ruling thought governs the whole, and determines the texture of the great fabric of history. This supreme thought of God, this ultimate aim of the whole course of history, this final goal of the dealings of God, we call His kingdom, the communion of mankind with God. And this is the thought of His love.

We begin to understand history when we regard it from this point of view. Much will ever remain unsolved to us in the course of events. God is a God that hideth Himself. Why He leads one man in this way, and another in an opposite one; endows one man with wealth and prosperity, and seems to provide

miserably for another ; makes the path of one smooth and easy, and that of another rough and difficult ; gives sunshine in one place, and in another darkens life with sadness ; leads one into temptations and dangers, in which it seems he must all but sink, and lets the work of the good powers of life be almost exhausted upon another—why, moreover, God so richly endows one nation, and seems to condemn another to a stunted existence ; gives to the one power, fame and sovereignty, to another the doom of vassalage ; impresses on the brow of one the royal seal of genius, and seems to raise another but little above the level of the brute ; lets some enjoy the full blessings of Christianity, while darkness and error imprison the minds of others ;—all these things are enigmas of which we shall never be capable of finding the full solution. Presentient glimpses into the process of the Divine government of the world are indeed already sometimes vouchsafed us. Beholding the guidance manifest in our own life, upon the darkest paths of which conscience so often casts a light which discloses to us the righteousness of God's judgments—beholding this, I say, we feel sure that the moral law of a just and holy will rules also in the dark paths of the history of nations ; nay, sometimes we almost seem to see the hand of the Judge Himself writing the sentence of condemnation upon the proud walls of human glory and announcing their fall, and His holy form passing over the ruins of earthly greatness. But still the history of individuals and of nations will remain a book of

enigmas which we shall be unable to solve until history shall have reached its appointed end. Then will God be justified in all His works, and His ways be made clear to us. But now we are directed to honour God in obscurity, to bow before His sovereignty, and to believe that He is the just One, even when He seems to be unjust, for He requires from every one only according to the measure bestowed upon him. Besides, dark as much may seem to us at present, one thing we are already certain of—eternal mercy reigns above all the confusion of earth. Events are ruled according to the counsels of infinite love; and the end of history is the eternal kingdom of peace. It is to this end that God is leading the nations. It is the highest joy of the mind to recognise, in anticipation, traces of this leading of God, in the histories of the different nations. It is true that God is approaching this end with but tardy footsteps; for He is a God of patience—incomprehensible patience, and He takes no step in advance before the fulness of the time for such a step has come. There is no hurry in His progress. The new thing which God makes never appears till the old has come to maturity. But, slow as may be the progress, He is yet surely advancing towards the goal.

Moreover, the life of the individual, even of the meanest among His humble children, is interwoven with the great course of the world's history. One end is appointed to both. The path of each of us is to flow whither the history of all nations is flowing—into

His eternal kingdom. The life of each of us is subject to the same law as the history of the race—the law of His love, of the eternal counsels of his love. This, then, is certain, that all that exists or happens is founded upon the counsel of God's love.

But the counsel of love became with respect to a sinful world, a counsel of *grace*.

For in the way to the end stands the obstacle of human sin. It has placed itself in God's way. It is only by its conquest that that way can reach its end. God's holiness must condemn sin, but His grace desires to forgive it. He forgives by condemning it. Our sin was condemned on the cross; our sin is forgiven by the cross. This is the triumph of love—to build the kingdom of grace out of the very ruins into which sin had crushed God's world.

Zermalmen konnte er die Welt der Sünden,  
Doch ihm gefiel's sein Reich darauf zu gründen.\*

His counsel of love became a counsel of grace.

That of which the noblest spirits of the old world had some presentiment, that grace—as a Sophocles expresses it—sits at the side of the Deity upon the world's throne<sup>(12)</sup> has become to us a certainty; for the cross is the testimony of grace. The whole history of Divine revelation is a history of grace. All the opposition of man was unable to stay its progress or exhaust its patience. Each step in advance was a triumph of grace over human sin. The cross was the

\* He might have crushed the world of sin, but it pleased Him to found His kingdom upon it.



triumph perfected. The cross has since been the symbol of victory and of consolation in suffering. And the preaching of the Gospel has been, from the days of the apostles, the preaching of the cross, for it is the preaching of grace. This word of grace it is which has conquered the world, and which renews the heart.

We have seen that grace is indispensable to us because we are sinners; that it is certain, because God is compassionate love, and that the cross is the Divine testimony to this fact. Grace is, moreover, *universal*.

For they mistake the heart of God, who, in supposed reverence for his absolute sovereignty, limit His counsel of grace to the election of individuals, and exclude others therefrom. Certain isolated texts of Scripture are appealed to; as, for instance, that well known one, 'Many are called, but few are chosen.' But this text does not speak of the eternal counsel of God, but of the actual result of his offers of grace. No; if even our heart cannot bear the thought that God should have beforehand excluded the majority of mankind from His gracious purpose, still less could the heart of God; for His heart is greater than ours. God has not His individual favourites, as Homer's gods had; His heart belongs to all, and Christ died for the whole world. God will have all men to be saved; He willeth not that any should perish; and the voice of Mercy cries to all, 'Come unto me, all who are weary and heavy laden.' The grace of God reaches as far as heaven; and he who is at last

excluded therefrom excludes himself. As Divine pity, manifested on earth in Christ Jesus, uttered over Jerusalem the lamentation, 'How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not !' so will the last word of eternal love to the lost also be : 'And ye would not !' For certainly God will constrain none ; neither can He. He cannot but recognise the freedom of man ; for He does not treat us as merely natural objects, but as free personal beings. Hence He must also leave us liberty to reject His grace, and to withstand His love. We ought not to be capable of reconciling our hearts to this ; but we are so. But though we may harden ourselves against the love of God, and have no love for ourselves, the grace of God still remains all-comprehensive and unlimited.

And yet, when we endeavour to point to this grace, as extended to all, in the history of nations and individuals, it must be confessed that the actual condition of mankind seems everywhere at variance with this demand of our heart, this conviction of our faith. Here we must confess the limited nature of our knowledge ; for, in but too many instances, we are unable to show that the God of history, as He appears in the lives of individuals and nations, is also indeed the God of grace—of universal grace. One is, from his youth up, surrounded by God with the protection of the most careful moral training, and brought under the influences of religion ; another is placed in the midst

of temptations and dangers, and allowed to grow up in a moral atmosphere which seems beforehand to consign him to ruin. In the former case, it seems impossible for the man to be lost; in the latter, impossible for him to be saved. Nor do the circumstances of nations less differ than those of individuals. Should we consider it an indifferent matter whether a man were born in a nation enjoying in full measure all the blessings of Christianity, or belonged by birth to a country which no ray of the Gospel had as yet illumined? Again, to what dangers and temptations are some exposed by their own natures, from which others of more happy dispositions are free! To all which we can answer nothing, but that God is a God that hideth Himself, and that the will of God, as manifested in His treatment whether of nations or individuals, appears to us, not as a will of universal grace, but only of power. Let us not, however, forget that all this affects only one side of human nature. It is true that it may often seem to us as though man were the least free of all creatures, entirely dependent upon his position in life, which he did not bestow upon himself, and upon those overpowering impulses of his nature of which he cannot rid himself. And certainly we are instruments in the hand of One who employs us in His service after His own pleasure. But this side of our life and nature, according to which we are, with respect to God, as the clay in the hand of the potter, is not the whole position of man towards God. We are this, but but we are more than this; and our relation to God is

not summed up by saying that we are only the instruments of His power, and utterly void of will. Behind the world of our external life lies the inner world of our moral resolves ; and here we are free. The moral quality of our willing and doing, whether we determine for God or against Him, whether we let Him do His work in our souls or not, is, after all, a matter of our own deciding. In our inmost souls we are free. Under whatever external control we may be placed, no force can control the aspirations of our souls. Whether they be raised towards God, or sunk into the depths, in either case the decision rests with our own wills ; and it is we who are responsible for it. However much the external circumstances in which we are placed, the temptations to which we are exposed, the desires of our own nature, may work upon our moral nature,—all the influences which we experience have a limit which they do not pass, and that is the limit laid upon them by the freedom of the will, which is essential to human nature—to our personality.

But to this God has an inward relation. A mysterious link exists between God and every human soul. <sup>(13)</sup> Every one experiences in his inmost heart the secret influences of God. Even to that soul which no word of salvation has reached, God speaks in secret and mysterious language. This voice of God is heard by the conscience of every man. God is inwardly near to each of us. The Spirit of God testifies to each, and each understands it, when this Spirit of God inwardly warns and secretly reproves him for the sin

which he either wills or does. Each man, moreover, feels within him that secret attraction which draws him away, past time and space and the possessions of this perishing world towards the world of eternity. By none, indeed, is peace of soul found in this way, and by none is the true moral freedom of a sanctified will attained through this testimony of God in the conscience ; far rather does it produce the restlessness of a search and enquiry after God, the painful feeling of moral impotence and weakness, and the desire for freedom from this bondage. Yet it makes a difference whether we suffer this spirit of restlessness and desire to prevail in the soul, or whether we repress it, and so become immersed in the vanity of the world. This, too, is an effect of Divine grace,—of a universal grace of God, which works in all men. This working of the Spirit of God is the pledge of a better future.

And what a multitude of other moral forces are, from all sides, ever exerting their influence upon man ! For what are the social relations under which we are placed,—our home and native land, our vocation and our friendships, and whatever else may be thus designated,—what but so many voices awakening and strengthening our moral sense ? To all these must be added those scattered seeds of primeval truth which mankind possesses, like the last rays of a sun already set, still faintly illuminating the darkness. For where is there a people which has not preserved at least some fragments of the ancient heritage of the fathers of our race ? Corrupted, indeed, and disfigured, and



weakened in their effects, yet still showing, in the midst of disfigurement, traces of original truth and beauty, and not wholly without that influence which can never be entirely absent from ever so obscure a reminiscence of the truth.

It is into this world of moral forces, ideas, and operations that the word of the Gospel enters, and rouses by its call all those dormant desires which, from the inmost depths of the human soul, cry, though often unconsciously, for redemption. As the question of Christ to the blind man in the Gospel, whether he were willing to receive his sight, revived within him all his grief for his blindness, and recalled to his consciousness, in full strength, that desire of his soul which habit had almost extinguished; so is it here. This longing for deliverance does not contribute to it; it is not deliverance itself, but it is its pre-requisite. To produce this pre-requisite is the end of God's dealings, whether in the history of nations or in the guidance of individuals. We must first become poor in ourselves, to be capable of receiving the riches of grace.

Such was the way in which God led mankind before Christ. He did not merely prepare salvation for man, but also man for salvation,—the former was His work in Israel; the latter, in the heathen world. Never were nations so richly endowed with the noblest intellectual gifts, as those which we call the classic nations. In these, God was pleased to exhibit, in all their fulness, the capabilities of human nature; but at the



same time its limits. For richly as their life was adorned with the loveliest productions of the natural intellect, they could not find salvation; and the true God, the God of redemption, ever remained to them 'The Unknown God.' The history of nations is always their Divine education. The aim of this education is the production of receptivity for the grace of God; and the condition of this receptivity is poverty of spirit. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of God.' We call Socrates the greatest man of the Grecian world; and the oracle of Delphi called him the wisest. Wherein, then, did his greatness consist? and what was his wisdom? What but his consciousness and confession of his poverty? This, too, was the end of God's dealing with the ancient world in general, to effect a conviction of poverty, and a hunger after a direct revelation of the grace of God. We have a series of witnesses in the latter ages of the ancient world, all confessing their poverty, and showing that they knew of no other remedy than the grace of God. And the strange dreams also of supposed revelations, by which even the nobler spirits of the latter ages of heathenism were deluded, bear witness to a soul-hunger after a revelation of the grace and truth which can proceed from God alone. <sup>(14)</sup> But 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.'

And this, too, is the end of God's dealings with ourselves. We must become poor in ourselves, that God may fill us with the riches of His grace. When it is said that a rich man shall hardly enter the kingdom

of God, this is equally true of the rich in intellect and the rich in virtue.

We are so proud of our intellect and of our education ; and yet these are of no avail in the chief matter of all. They are capable of refining our temporal life, but they cannot gain for us eternal life, for they pass away, together with this temporal existence to which they belong. When the time comes for us to lie down and die, if we have nothing else to cling to but our pride of intellect and education, a sadder spectacle could scarcely be beheld. And pride in our virtue is by no means better. It is indeed hard, infinitely hard, not to earn and deserve our soul's salvation, but to be obliged to owe it to grace. And yet we might and must know that, even in this life, all that is best is obtained and possessed, not by merit and desert, but by free favour. <sup>(15)</sup> But we would rather wear ourselves out in the most toilsome work with our resisting nature, and even in the hardest sacrifices and penances, than be indebted for our eternal salvation to free grace ; and this only that our pride may be nourished. Certainly, grace will not be bestowed upon moral idlers ; it requires work both to precede and follow it, but the work which leads to humility and not to pride. The entrance into the kingdom of God is closed against pride. It is the object of all God's dealings to bring us to humility. God has, indeed, hard work with us—a long work of untiring patience ; but His purpose concerning each of us—the purpose which He seeks by all means, and in all the ways in

which He leads us, to attain—is to make us humble, that so we may be capable of receiving His grace, which alone is our salvation, and which alone can lead us to the truth of our destination. It was this grace and truth that appeared in Jesus Christ.

## LECTURE IV.

### THE GOD-MAN.



THE Divine answer to man's sin, is God's grace ; and the supreme manifestation of this grace is Jesus Christ. Who, then, is Jesus Christ ? Such is the question which has agitated the world since the Church made faith in Him her confession.

When Christianity would express, in the highest and most honourable terms, what she knows of Christ, she calls Him *the God-man*. This is the Church's confession ; and this will, with your permission, form my subject to-day.

When we thus designate Christ, we comprise in this one word, all that we confess and believe concerning Him. But are we not making an impossible combination ? for, could we attempt to unite greater opposites than the idea of the God-man involves ? Certainly the world could never have conceived this thought. It is an absolutely new one ; it did not originate in the mind of man ; it was none of his production ; it never could have existed had not the existence of the God-man been a fact. This alone could have emboldened any one to venture upon

such a notion. The thought exists only because the fact exists.

But does the fact exist? Is Jesus Christ really the God-man? Such is the question now addressed to us. The Christ of history, it is said, does not correspond to the Christ of dogma. The Church teaches another Christ than what He truly was.<sup>(1)</sup> He was not the God-man; therefore He must not be thus thought of. Such is the assertion now made, and which we proceed to consider.

The doctrine of the God-man combines *two sides* into a unity—the human and the Divine. We will consider both; and first, the manner in which Scripture presents them to our notice.

Nothing is more certain than that Jesus was *man*, in the full sense of the word. It is a complete and perfect human life which the Gospels portray. Not externally only, but in His heart of hearts, did Jesus lead a human life. We are looking into the depths of a complete, a true human soul. He experienced all the emotions by which we are moved. Sorrow and joy, love and anger, zeal and fear, moved His soul as they do ours. He was no celestial apparition hovering about the earth. He was a corporeal man, who lived a real human life on earth among men; who was angry with one, loved others, and called some His friends. The misconception of His countrymen pained Him; the enmity He encountered was a deep grief; the love and fidelity He met with were a comfort and refreshment to Him: to pour out His

burdened heart in prayer to His Father, or, in His hours of sorrow, to know that friendly brother-men were near Him, was a need felt by Him as it is by us. The world of sensations which depress or raise our spirits acted in its full variety on His also. And even the darkest and hardest thing in our life—the conflict with sin—even this did not leave Him untouched. He had to encounter temptations—temptations to abandon His work, to avoid His sufferings. These did not approach His outer life alone ; they drew near to the very depths of His soul. It was within that He had to defend Himself against their attacks, and to oppose them, that sin might not draw Him within its sphere, as it sought to do.

Here is however the point where the paths of His, and of our life diverge. For if anything is certain, it is this—that Jesus allowed *sin* no entrance into His inner life. Not for an instant was the pure mirror of His soul obscured by the dark power of sin. The essence of sin is selfishness. Never did the world see even an approach to so unselfish a life as His. Never did He for an instant think of Himself. Never did He make even the most remote attempt to advance His own interest. It was a temptation brought very near to Him in the solitude of the wilderness, to seek His own enjoyment, to promote His own honour, and to possess Himself of worldly power. It was the image of the carnal Messiah of the age which the tempter held before Him. He allowed this thought, however, no entrance into His heart, but rejected it with



horror. The little faith of His disciples, the insensibility of the multitude, the wickedness of His adversaries, might well have called forth impatience or ill humour; yet, though they did extort a sigh of sorrow, they never provoked a hasty word. That deadly anguish which overwhelmed Him in the solitary hours of His last night, might well have terrified Him from the path of suffering which lay before Him; but He poured out the agony of His soul in prayer, and overcame the temptation by His victorious obedience. He conquered temptations of every form and degree by the ever equal holiness of His will.

We have only to bring before us the portrait sketched in the Gospels of His life and work, to be quite certain that, in His case, a really holy human life was lived. This had ever been the ideal of the human mind. The various religions had dreamed of it. Systems of philosophy, each according to the measure of its moral notions, had invented such an ideal. Plato had spoken of it, in words almost prophetic. The Stoics had bestowed upon it the appellation of 'The Wise One;' but they never found it, nor was the ideal ever realised.<sup>(2)</sup> In Christ it became reality, and that in a far higher sense than ever entered the mind of man to conceive. For the holiness of Jesus is the holiness of *love*. The præ-Christian ages had, it may be, imagined a blameless justice, a proud sublimity, or an insensible tranquillity as their ideal. But that the highest attainment should be ministering love, and that true greatness should be found in unselfish humility, was not

known to the world till Jesus taught it by the fact of His life, and exhibited the realisation of this ideal in His own person.<sup>(3)</sup>

And that He did so, I should not have supposed any one capable of denying. The evangelists have not contented themselves with asserting that His was a holy life, but have portrayed it under every aspect ; and even the very sharpest eyes are incapable of detecting in this picture a single feature that can obscure it. He challenged His adversaries to convict Him of sin, and they were compelled to be silent. He affirmed concerning Himself, and His life proved it, that He maintained a communion with God which knew no limitation—not even that which sin creates in the case of the most pious. He spoke and acted with the authority of a man conscious of no sin to interpose between Him and His Father. He forgave the sins of others. He himself needed no forgiveness. He taught us daily to pray, ‘Forgive us our trespasses.’ He never prayed for forgiveness Himself—not even in Gethsemane, not even on the cross. We all feel a moral necessity, at least on special occasions, in our more serious hours, in heavy visitations, to bow before God, and acknowledge ourselves guilty before Him. This may even be said to be the standard of our morality. Never did any man bear such a load of sorrow, never was a man plunged into such depths of anguish, as Jesus ; yet to accuse Himself never entered His mind. He only thought of the sin of His people. He prayed for forgiveness for His people, not for

Himself. If there had been but the shadow of a sin in Him, it could not at such moments have escaped His consciousness. But this consciousness remained ever the same. He knew Himself to be the Redeemer from sin, the Judge of the sinful world,—to have no share in its sin. It was just during the very last days of His life, and of His sufferings,—just when He, the accused, was standing before His judges,—that He declared Himself, in the most decided manner, to be the Judge of the world. It was His consciousness of absolute sinlessness which He thus expressed; and if anything is certain concerning the person of Jesus Christ, it is this. Utterly vain are the attempts which have been made to place Him also under the law of sin.<sup>(4)</sup> Such attempts are totally irreconcilable with the facts both of His life and consciousness. If, however, His sinlessness is established, the other tenets of Church doctrine concerning His person are but its necessary consequences.

If Jesus is an absolutely sinless man, then He is a *miracle*; for then He differs not only in degree but in kind from every other human being, and is something absolutely new within the circumference of human nature. For, as we are all aware, we might wander through all parts of the world, at all periods of time, and not find one single sinless man; for sin is—and we all know it—too deeply interwoven with the very roots of the existence and nature of the whole race, to make it possible that we should be, for a moment, doubtful

as to the result. If, then, there ever was one pure human being in the world of sinners, He was a miracle. And then, too, His origin must have been of a miraculous kind. Even if the Gospels did not report what they do of His conception and birth, our reason would demand it; for we all admit that no perfectly holy man was ever produced in the ordinary way. That which is born of the flesh is flesh. If holiness was to be attained, a fresh beginning must be made; and this beginning must be the act of the Holy Ghost and of humble faith—a moral event, and not a merely natural one.

This is the case with Christ, as it is with Christianity itself, for He is Christianity. Christianity is not a production of the human mind, but a creative act of God; and such, too, is He. He entered into the community of our race, but He is not the production of our race. He is a branch upon the tree of human nature, but He is the noble scion of this tree,—that is to say, His origin was miraculous; He was conceived and born of woman, but not begotten by man.

Even the very first promise received by the sinful human race connected the future salvation with the Son of the woman. From that time forward, mankind was expecting a holy birth. Certain religions, as *e.g.*, the Persian, spoke of a virgin, who should give a Redeemer to the world; their hopes form, as it were, the echo of the prophecies of Scripture. The Greeks deceived themselves with mythical narratives of the

miraculous origin of certain celebrities—fictions in which the fathers saw presentient anticipations of the mystery of Jesus Christ. <sup>(5)</sup> In all this a natural feeling is expressed. For the Redeemer of the world must be a gift of God, His origin a holy one, and his conception in his mother's womb an act of faith and obedience. For His entrance into connection with the human race could not but be brought about in a moral manner. It is this which is the true glory of the Virgin Mary; and she needs no other. It is not necessary in order to give her the honour that is her due, to exalt her above the limits of the common moral weakness of our nature. To such honour she herself never laid claim. Her honour was to have been the mother of the Redeemer, and the handmaid of the Lord, who from the beginning of His ministry at Cana, till its termination on the cross, obeyed His direction to keep at the same distance as all other mortals, that she might, through that very act, draw as near to Him as all the redeemed. It is the believing lowliness with which she placed herself at the service of the Divine will that forms her imperishable fame. Through this she became capable of being the mother of the Redeemer. Through this she became not indeed the giver of the Saviour, for He is the gift of God alone—but the instrument by which that gift was bestowed. <sup>(6)</sup> The gracious Word of God and man's relation thereto by faith—such was from the beginning the way by which the history of salvation advanced, and such too was the way in which its

consummation entered into the world in Christ Jesus. Receptive faith on the part of man responds to the gift of God. And so too was Jesus given by God, and received by the human race. This is manifested in the fact of the Saviour's birth of a virgin. This constitutes the intrinsic necessity of that virgin birth among those kindred elements by which salvation was realised. They, therefore, who strike out of the Apostles' creed, the words 'conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,' violate the necessary postulate of our salvation, and shake the foundations of the edifice of Christian faith. (7) For if Jesus came into the world like all other men, then too is He only like all others. If He does not differ from us in His origin, He does not differ from us in other respects, and cannot be our Saviour. Then, too, He is but one among the many, is not the comprehension of the race—is not the One Being comprising the whole race, is not our representative whose Person and cause have a universal importance, is not the Son of Man.

You know that the title by which Jesus usually designated Himself was—'*The Son of Man*;' and what does this mean? He does not call Himself merely a son of man, not merely one among many; He is *the* Son of Man. Every stage of Israel's history points beyond itself to a future in which it is to find its true consummation. And this future appeared in Him. Hence He calls Himself the Desire of the old times. He it was 'whom prophets and righteous men



desired to see and hear' (Matt. xiii. 16-19). But He was the fulfilment of Israel's history, only that He might be the end of the history of mankind. He was not merely the Son of David but the Son of Man. It was He whom the nations were seeking after, of whom they had some dreamy presentiment, whom their hearts craved after, whom the history of our race intended, in whom it was to find its close, with whom it was to make a fresh beginning—the beginning of a new era, of a new race of men. This is what He means when He calls Himself the Son of Man. This title reaches far beyond the limits of Israel, it comprises in Him all nations and individuals, and designates Him as their common end. <sup>(8)</sup>

On this account He is also the *Lord of mankind*. It is thus that He is depicted especially by the first three evangelists. And He is the Lord of our race under all its aspects. He is the Lord of the Church of God. It was for Him that the Old Testament saints waited; He is the fulfilment of their hopes and the realisation of the predictions of the prophets. He is the Lord of all men. In Him every soul is to find its rest, and every mourner peace and comfort. And not merely individuals; the whole world is directed to His Word, and its future fate depends upon the position which it assumes with respect to Him. To believe or not to believe in Him, decides the eternal destiny of every one; for the eternal decision is in His hand, and it is His mouth which is to speak the final sentence. In short, He is absolutely Lord of the world,

and of each individual soul. He has an absolute relation to the world. <sup>(9)</sup>

It is thus that the first three evangelists speak of Him.

But this, His relation to the world, is based upon *His relation to God*. And herein lies the deepest mystery of His nature; 'All things are delivered unto Me of my Father,' says He, in a well known passage of St Matthew's Gospel (xi. 27); 'and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; and no man knoweth the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him.' His relation to the world is based upon His relation to God. And what kind of relation is this? He places Himself on a level with God with respect to the world. As God is a hidden mystery to the world, so also is He; but God is no mystery to Him. The Father and the Son—these two are manifest to each other, though hidden from the world. He does not belong to the world, but to that deep mystery—God. It is but a short saying which the evangelist reports, but it opens a wide prospect into the hidden depths of His nature. These hidden depths, which the first three evangelists rather hint at than state, form the special theme of St John's Gospel.<sup>(10)</sup> It is he who discloses to us that secret background—His eternal being—and shows us the roots of His existence in His eternal fellowship with God. It is this which meets us at every turn, when we peruse His life as depicted by this evangelist. But all that St John, or rather all that Jesus in the narrative of St John, tells

us of His eternal being, is summed up in the title, *The Son of God*. It is not merely His vocation as the Messiah, which this appellation is used to point out, though this was indeed the sense in which the Jews employed it; but it is the special pre-eminence of His person, which is thus signified. Others, either specially called of God, or brought by their piety into peculiar nearness to Him, may have been called sons of God—He only is *the* Son of God in a sense that none other is; that is to say, that His origin is in God Himself, in the eternal essence of God. Thence did He proceed and come into the world; and therefore He has a community of nature with the Father. For in Him is the fulness of the Divine life. He is the life, He is the light; He is grace and truth itself. He belongs not to time, but to eternity; for before Abraham was, He is eternally with God, in the glory of God, and in the communion of His love. It is thus that Jesus testifies of Himself. And when Thomas greets the risen Saviour with the words, significantly placed by the evangelist at the end of his gospel, ‘My Lord and my God!’ Jesus accepts this confession as an appropriate expression of faith in Him.<sup>(11)</sup>

Since, then, this has been the creed of the apostles, the creed of the Church, our own creed, we all call Him our Lord, and bow the knee in His name.

This is the doctrine of the apostles, as laid down in their epistles; this has ever been the usage of the Apostolic Church. As the Jew was distinguished from the heathen by the fact that he invoked Jehovah

in prayer, so are Christians distinguished from both Jews and heathens by their invocation of the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Their prayer to Jesus is the proof of their belief in His deity. For to God alone is prayer offered.<sup>(12)</sup>

And this usage has continued from the days of the apostles, through all ages of the Christian Church. A few years after the death of the Apostle John, Pliny, the Roman pro-consul of Asia Minor, furnished his imperial friend, Trajan, with information concerning the Christians of that country, and mentioned it expressly, as their peculiar religious custom, that they glorified Christ as God in their hymns. And Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian of the time of the Emperor Constantine, tells us of the many hymns and songs of the first centuries in which the Divinity of Christ was celebrated.<sup>(13)</sup> And this has been the faith of the Church in all ages. Her hymns, her prayers, her whole worship, even her art, bear the same testimony as her creed and her teaching. The denial of this faith is not primitive but subsequent.

It is true that the *denial* of this faith has likewise descended throughout the different centuries, from those Judaically minded professors in the early days of Christianity, who saw in Christ a mere prophet, down to the rationalists, who believe they have exhausted His significance in affirming Him to be the ideal of virtue, or those moderns who think they show Him respect enough in honouring Him as the religious genius of mankind. But if here, as everywhere, cause and

effect must correspond the one to the other, such a cause is not sufficient to explain the effect. The Christ of history must have been different from the Christ of rationalism, if we are to understand the fact of Christianity, and different too from the Christ of modern notions, if He is to be the Atoner and Redeemer. And if He is not this, what is He to us? For what we want is reconciliation with God. But the reconciliation of the world requires the God-man, and not merely the religious genius.

What I have hitherto said, my respected hearers, has been intended to establish the fact, as laid down in Scripture and acknowledged by the Church. Let us now see how it approves itself to our reason, by considering the necessity, the possibility, and the reality of the God-man.

But let us not forget, while engaging in this discussion, that in this, as in every other instance, the fact does not depend upon our reason. To understand the fact is a want of our intellect; and the whole history of Church doctrine concerning the person of Jesus Christ is a continuous effort to master this subject. This is an end we shall never perfectly attain; yet we strive, and cannot cease from striving after it. But behind all our reasoning stands the fact itself, and faith therein.

*Wherefore* is the God-man? This is a question which has been agitated ever since the mysteries of the Christian faith have been made subjects of thought. The God-man cannot be a merely incidental fact; it is

a want of our intellect to comprehend Him in His intrinsic *necessity*. Here, as in all cases, the chief question is, as to the wherefore.

The ultimate reason for the incarnation of the Son of God is to be found in the sin of man. For sin requires atonement, and atonement requires the God-man.

When John the Baptist directed his disciples to Jesus, he called Him 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' It was from this point of view that they were to understand Jesus, and it is from this point of view that we, too, must understand Him. When we get perplexed concerning Him, by the manifold objections which we hear, let us fall back upon this certainty—He is the Redeemer of the sinful world. As Christians, there is nothing so certain to us as this, to know Him and believe in Him as our Saviour. If we would understand Him, it must be from this point of view. This was the end of His appearing; this, also, was the reason of His incarnation. He came to seek and to save that which was lost. This formed the subject of all apostolic preaching; this has ever been the creed of the whole Church. If the evangelists relate the life of Christ, it is in His death that their narratives culminate. They mean, He became man that He might die for us. When St Paul would comprise in one word, the matter of his preaching, that word is, the Cross. 'I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified.' When St Peter would pour out



his whole heart, he speaks of the Just One who suffered 'for the unjust' (1 Pet. iii. 18). And when St John, in Revelation, beheld in the Spirit the heavenly company, their ascription of glory was addressed to the Lamb that 'was slain, and that has redeemed us to God by His blood' (Rev. v. 9). It is Christ the Redeemer who is proclaimed by each apostle, and preached by the whole Church. Nor are her prayers and hymns ever warmer and heartier than when they praise the crucified Jesus, and tell of His wounds and sufferings. Christian art, too, has ever sought her highest triumphs in the delineation of His countenance beneath the crown of thorns, and of the Saviour upon the cross. Our whole heart is poured out when we call Him our Saviour; and it is the Church's highest glory to exalt Him as the Redeemer. Redemption—this is the great act of God's eternal mercy; this it is on which the fate of the whole world, on which the fate of each one of us depends; this is the great act of grace towards a sinful and opposing world—an act of freest, most unmerited grace. For who will say that He deserved it? In other matters we may think of our own merits, we must all be silent here. 'Tis mercy all, immense and free'—mercy to a world of sinners. We should have been lost but for this act of redeeming grace. If we would understand Jesus Christ, it must be as our Redeemer.

It is true that the task undertaken by Christ was not merely to redeem us, but also to lead us on to eternal perfection. In Him we are to attain that end

to which we were eternally destined, and in Him is all creation to attain perfection. Into that world of glory and of perfect communion with God, whither He is gone before, we are to follow Him; and the end of all things is that great harmony of the universe which the sin of man destroyed, and which Christ restores. He is not our Head alone; He has become the Head of all things, in whom the universe is to recover its unity. But the way to this end lies through atonement and redemption. It was for this purpose that Christ became man, that by redeeming He might carry us on unto perfection.<sup>(14)</sup>

Long was He expected; from of old had He been predicted, until He came in the fulness of the times. For from the beginning had reconciliation been longed for, and the Atoner hoped for. He is called He that should come. The heathen had a presentiment of Him. They tell of the appearance of the Gods upon earth, and of the exaltation of men to the dignity of deity, the former in the incarnations of the East, the latter in the apotheoses of the West. These are, it is true, but fancies and fictions, and the genuine moral germ—the notion of redemption—is wanting in them all. Yet still they are presentiments of the truth, that a bridge must be thrown over the abyss which separates the Holy God from sinful man,—that God must come to us, in order that we may come to Him.<sup>(15)</sup> From of old God revealed Himself in Israel. His eternal grace and truth followed after man, to call Him back, and to restore the union which the sin of man had broken. All these revelations were preliminary,

and prophetic of a revelation in which He was Himself to appear, and to restore in Himself the bond of communion. 'When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son.' Sin is the reason for the incarnation of Christ.

There is in recent theology a widely diffused opinion that Christ would have become man even if there had been no sin in the world. It is said: Sin occasioned not the incarnation itself but only its manner, its lowliness, and abundant suffering. On the contrary, the incarnation of the Son of God was required both by the idea of God as self-imparting Love, and the idea of man to whose nature belongs the highest degree of receptivity for God and for communion with Him, and finally, by the idea of the absolute religion; for only a divine-human religion, having the God-man for its centre and object, can be the perfect religion.<sup>(16)</sup> But by this way of reasoning we shall arrive only at the kind of communion which takes place between God and the Christian, the child of God, only at the mutual surrender of the loving Father to His child, and of the God-loving man to his Father, only at the God who is the God of man and the man who is a man of God, but not at the God-man proper, who is something more than a man of God. It is true that this communion of God and man is the primitive purpose and original aim of God, and therefore the ultimate object of the mission of Christ. But that this mission should be necessary, to do away with the transgression which prevented the realiza-

tion of the Divine purpose, and thus to bring us back to God who were alienated from Him,—this was occasioned by sin alone. Hence, it is only by starting from sin, and not from an idea of God or of man, or the like, that the incarnation of Christ can be understood. Not a philosopher able to inculcate ideas, but John the Baptist, the preacher of repentance, was Christ's forerunner to prepare His way before Him. And his saying concerning Christ was: Behold the Lamb of God, that beareth away the sin of the world. It is in the way of conviction of sin and repentance, and not in the way of speculation, that Christ is to be known. For we truly know Him only when we know Him as the Redeemer from sin. It was to the sin of man that the grace of God replied with this greatest of all gifts, the gift of the God-man. All the more should we esteem this grace, to which sin became an inducement to disclose to us the whole depth of its love. For where sin abounded grace did much more abound (Rom. v. 20), in Him who appeared as the Mediator between us and God.

But if He was to appear as Mediator between the two, to restore and to perfect the communion which sin had broken off, it was necessary that He should also belong to both. He must stand in perfect fellowship both with God and with us, to represent even in His very person that perfect bond between the two which it was to be the work of His life to create. He must belong to us, that He might represent us; and yet, He must at the same time be above us; for

we are to come to the Father through Him. He must be one with God to redeem us ; for the work of atonement and redemption could be the act of God alone ; and it is of the fulness of Divine grace that we must receive when we receive of His fulness. If, as we believe, we are to have in Him, the Atoner, the Deliverer from sin, Godhead and manhood must be united in Him. Sin requires atonement, and atonement requires the God-man.

But how can these two be united in one ? Is the God-man *possible* ? Are not Godhead and manhood opposites which exclude one another ? They would be such if they were merely opposed to each other as are finity and infinity, if a connection did not also exist between them, if we were not akin to God. But we were made in the image of God ; we bear in our nature His image and likeness ; and we are of Divine extraction. If we think of God, we think of Him after our image ; and we do not think incorrectly. And as God has ever thought of and willed Himself, so has He ever lovingly willed man, in order to impart Himself to Him. He willed Himself to us, and we ought to will ourselves to Him and in Him.

There exists both a bond of love and an attraction of love between God and us. It is true that God is the Self-sufficient and Self-blessed, needing none other for His happiness and perfection ; but it is His love which so draws Him down to us, that He inclines towards us, and imparts Himself to us. He whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, has chosen us for the habi-

tation in which His love is to dwell. And in proportion as we departed from Him by sin, did His grace follow and draw near to us, till it sunk into our very flesh and blood. That He could do this—in other words, the possibility of the incarnation—lies in the condescending love of God.

And in the destiny of man. For this is : to receive God into ourselves, to bear Him within us, to have Him for the indwelling object of our thoughts and desires, of our whole inner life. Since we have lost this indwelling object through sin, our soul hungers to be again filled with the life of God. It was for this purpose that the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily in Jesus, even that out of His fulness we might receive grace for grace. Hence the possibility of the incarnation lies as much in the nature of man as in the nature of God.

But how are we to conceive of *the reality* of the God-man? And shall we ever attain the power of forming a conception thereof? It is a necessity to faith to strive after knowledge; but let us not forget that it is not our knowledge which believes, but our faith which knows. Who has ever really known God? Would we wait to believe in Him until we comprehend Him? Are we not, without this, directly conscious of His existence? Our convictions do not arise solely from the reasonings of our minds; and this is the case here also. No one has ever fully understood the nature of God; no one has ever fully known the nature of man. What then? If, when we think of



God and man, much as we may reflect, there still remain enigmas, shall we be surprised if, when we think of the God-man, all enigmas are not solved? He would not be as He is, the most wondrous phenomenon on earth, if there were nothing mysterious to us in Him.

When we speak of the God-man, we combine into a unity the greatest possible opposites—Godhead and manhood. It is an immense thought; it is an unparalleled word. Is it a possible thought? When we lay due emphasis upon the Divinity of Christ, do we not slur over His true humanity? Or, when we maintain His true humanity, are we not in danger of losing sight of His Divinity? The thoughts of men have erred on both sides, ever since they have sought to master the notion of the God-man. Some have esteemed Him a mere man, filled in a peculiar degree with the spirit of revelation; to others He has been a being from a higher world, passing through this world only as an apparition, without really belonging to our race. The Church has maintained the idea of the God-man in opposition to both these errors; but for a long time they were still working in her own bosom, and ever breaking out under various forms. And this has continued to our own days. For when Rationalism sees in Christ only the most virtuous and wisest of men, or, as it is now expressed, a religious genius; this is but a revival of former Judaizing misconceptions of Christ. And when modern philosophy, from Spinoza to Hegel and his school, designates the

idea as the chief matter in Christ, the idea, viz., that God and man are intrinsically one—God, the truth of man, and man the reality of God—and declares that this thought expresses the ultimate mystery of all knowledge; the historical reality of Jesus, as pertaining to the sphere of history, and not to that of higher truths, being indifferent in comparison with this idea,—what else is all this but a revival of the former heathen mode of thought, which evaporated the human reality of Christ into a mere phantom? Rationalism holds fast the history but loses the idea; philosophy tries to preserve the idea but gives up the history—while the very speciality of Jesus Christ, the mystery of His person consists in the fact, that in Him both are combined into a unity, that manhood is taken into the fellowship of the Godhead, and the Godhead enters into the historical life of man. The Church's contemplation of the mystery of Christ's person during the course of the centuries, has been an ever renewed effort to conquer these errors and to conceive in thought, and fully express in words, that truth which Christendom has from the beginning received by faith. (17) And who would venture to say that she has yet attained her aim? We are still only on the road to the perfect knowledge of the son of God (Eph. iv. 13).

We may compare the course of Christian doctrine and theology with the history of Christian art.

You are all acquainted with those *representations of Christ*—of the earlier, or so-called Byzantine type—

which represent the form of Jesus, with an expression of Divine majesty, upon a golden background of celestial glory, but severed from human fellowship and void of earthly reality. We should all say that we have in them a symbolical expression of His hidden glory, but no representation of His historic reality. But still less would those other pictures content us which bring Jesus before us with human surroundings, after the fashion of a Dutch Genre-picture, but deprived of all Divine dignity and sublimity. While the former pictures endeavour to depict the truth at the expense of reality, these endeavour to restore reality at the expense of the truth. We should designate it as the highest aim of art to bring before us the Divine truth in the human reality—an aim scarcely, indeed, possible of attainment, yet still one worthy of the utmost effort. And the case is similar here. It may, perhaps, be said that the manner in which the ancients speak of the person of Jesus Christ somewhat corresponds with paintings of the Byzantine type. They are penetrated with the feeling of reverence, and we recognise, in their teaching, Him before whom every knee must bow; yet we sometimes miss the full reality of the incarnate Saviour. When the moderns however, seek to repair, as they think, this error, by merging the Divinity in the man Christ Jesus, and make amends for this by adorning Him with borrowed colours, which they bestow upon Him after their own fancy, our faith revolts from a form so strange to us. <sup>(18)</sup> The task set before our reason is, while seeing in Jesus the full, true, and

perfect man, to behold in His manhood the fulness of the Godhead—everything human, yet at the same time Divine.

It was thus that St John viewed Him, when he uttered that great saying, ‘The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth’ (John i. 14), and when he described this Word made flesh as the perfect revelation of the Father, as the light and life of the world, and His human nature as the vehicle of eternal life. Not only did His eternal Godhead veil itself in human form, but it passed from the condition of heavenly being into the historical reality of human existence,—out of the life of Divine glory, into the life of our earthly human nature. This was the thought in the mind of St John, when he began his gospel with those three famous propositions, which announce, as with powerful shocks, the mystery of which he is about to write: ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.’ For what he means to say in these three sentences is: He who appeared in time existed before time; He who appeared among us was with God; He who appeared in the flesh was by nature God. He exchanged the one existence for the other; He renounced His glory to enter into our poverty; He left eternity to enter into history. <sup>(19)</sup>

In the church, this, His self-denial, has been called the renunciation. It is true that a measure of uncertainty ever prevails in the notions of church teachers

as to the extent of this self-renunciation. It was felt better to set too narrow limits to it, than to stretch it too far, lest it should reach even to His Divine nature itself. For it has ever been unanimously held that the Divine nature is removed from all possibility of change. He remained what he was when he became man. But Luther rightly says: "we cannot draw Him deeply enough into our nature and flesh, it is still more consolatory to us." It is contrary to the impression made upon us by the gospel history, to the image of Christ as it has hitherto existed in our immediate consciousness, to admit a sphere of operation for the Divinity of Christ exterior to his human reality, and in which his human nature does not participate. For then the incarnation could not have been complete. It is true that it was the fulness of the Godhead that entered into flesh, but inasmuch as this fulness did enter therein, the human existence of Jesus becomes the historical reality of its presence and the limits of its operation. He bears within himself the infinitude of His eternal being, but this has betaken itself within the limits of temporal existence, and subjected itself to the laws of an earthly human life. He did not, as it were, reserve to himself a secret Divine agency beyond the bounds of His earthly human life. On the contrary, He unreservedly confined within these bounds, even His position as God in the universe, and the employment of His power with respect to the world, not to suffer them again to develope into full Omnipotence, till after He, the now incarnate God—had



ascended into Heaven. Let it not be said that this was unworthy of His Deity. For this self-denial and self-limitation were required by His office as the Saviour, required moreover by Divine love; and there is nothing so worthy of God as love and our salvation. <sup>(20)</sup> With this renunciation then, which his office of Saviour demanded, did he become man.

And what He did when He entered the world was the constant act of His earthly life. His was no single renunciation of the glory He had with the Father, but a renunciation again and again confirmed—there in the wilderness, when the future supremacy which He was one day to exercise over the world was held up before Him, and he was tempted to seize it by an act of self-will; and then, when the populace, in a fit of enthusiasm, after the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes, wanted to lead Him in triumph to Jerusalem, to seat Him on the throne of David, and to make Him a king, according to their own view of His office; (John vii. 15), and, hardest of all, in that darkest of nights, when, at the commencement of His passion, the tempter sought to attain by the horrors of fear what he had failed to attain by the seductions of hope. It was the continual act of His will, instead of that equal glory with the Father which was specially His own, again and again to choose and consent to the servile condition of that earthly life into which He had entered.

But the light of a hidden glory shone through that form of a servant, and that not only in His miracles.



All efforts to withdraw the miracles from His life are vain. <sup>(21)</sup> But they are not the chief matter; they are but the phenomenal effect of his office as Redeemer, and it is the Redeemer, the Saviour, that we seek in Him. It is not the majesty of the Divine omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience that gains Him all hearts, that conquers our hearts. It is not these that we seek in Him; for these could not help us. His power does but subserve His office, and goes no farther than this does. The mystery of the Incarnate is: the eternal life which overcomes our spiritual death, the holy light which chases the night of our sin, the love which seeks and saves us, the lost. Herein consists the manifestation of His glory. This, too, is the manifestation of God; for we do not truly comprehend God when we view Him only as Infinite Power. This is but the hem of His garment. He Himself is that holy, living love which fills our souls, satisfies our cravings, and is our essential portion. This is the fulness of the Godhead which dwelt in Him. ✓

Yet truly in the earthen vessel of fleshly weakness. There was a contradiction between His inner nature and His external historical reality. It is not merely the external life of Jesus, from His birth in the stable at Bethlehem to His death upon the cross and His burial in Joseph's tomb, that is pervaded by these opposites. This contradiction between His nature and reality is stamped upon His whole earthly existence. For that which He was in His proper nature, even the

eternal Son of God, of one substance with the Father, He did not appear to be ; and what He appeared was not the corresponding reality of what He essentially was. But may we not say that this is also, in a certain sense, the case with ourselves ? Even in us there is a contradiction between our destiny, which constitutes our nature, and our actual condition, which is subject to the law of perishableness. We are not yet in reality what we are in truth ; but we are waiting for a time when we shall be so. Then will the contradiction of our existence be solved. This contradiction was found in the highest sense in the case of Christ ; for in Him eternal life itself was sunk in time, the eternal Son of God in the weakness of flesh. He bore in His person the greatest possible contradiction between nature and reality. And that which He bore in His person was carried out in the history of His life. Here the contrast becomes still sharper, and is sharpest of all in His death, when eternal life sank in death, in order thus to become our life. This seemed to be the flattest denial, the very annihilation of His office as Saviour. Hence His disciples never could understand that He was to die. And certainly this was the very utmost that could happen. But this very utmost was also the crisis. The great knot which sin had tied was drawn as tightly as possible at His death ; but it was just then that grace undid it. His death was followed by His resurrection and His glory. Then were the contrasts of His life reconciled ; then was the contradiction which He bore within Him anni-

hilated ; for the risen Saviour was in reality that which He was by nature. Then was He proved to be that which He is : the Son of God no longer in weakness, but in power. Then did the history of His person attain its end, that it might henceforth become our history. For, what He experienced and suffered, He experienced and suffered for us. In His history, His work—the work of atonement, was consummated. This was His life's task, His vocation. It is of this, His work of atonement, that I intend to speak in our next lecture.

## LECTURE V.

### THE WORK OF JESUS CHRIST.



THE last time I addressed you, it was the person of Christ that formed the subject of discussion. My present lecture will treat of *His work*.

When we would describe the work of Jesus Christ, we are accustomed to speak of His *three offices*,—His prophetic, His priestly, and His royal offices. <sup>(1)</sup> We call Him the Prophet, Priest, and King, both in accordance with man's general calling of God, and with the type of Israel.

For our calling is a threefold one. As prophets, to recognise and to testify to the thoughts and works of God ; as priests, to consecrate our lives to Him ; and as kings, to govern the world. And the type furnished by Israel in its mediators between God and man—its prophets, priests, and kings—is also threefold. But sin made our calling vain, and the history of Israel remained only a prediction.

Our destiny found its higher realisation, and the history of Israel its final fulfilment, in Jesus Christ. He became *the prophet, the high priest, the king*.

It is by these three titles that we describe His

work ; and it is on the first two that I propose to address you to-day.

For thirty years He lived in retirement, and concealed in His own heart the secret of his person, until the time of His ministry arrived. The period before this was that of His development; the period succeeding it that of His work. <sup>(2)</sup> The years allotted Him to work in were but few. But the importance of a work is not to be estimated by the number of years it occupies. One single moment may reveal what eternity is. The three years of Christ's ministry lifted the world off its hinges.

When we endeavour to bring before our minds, with some degree of clearness, the inner *development* of Jesus before His baptism, we cannot but admit that the first step therein was His consciousness of Sonship, His consciousness of being indeed the Son of God. Out of this grew next His consciousness of being the destined Saviour. For He must needs have been certain of His eternal fellowship with the Father, before He could be certain of His office. This consciousness arose within Him in the secret intercourse of His soul with His Father in prayer. It was then, if we may so speak, that He found Himself as the eternal Son of the Father. His vocation, however, He chiefly met with in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. It was there that He read the will of His Father concerning Himself. *His baptism* expressed His determination to take upon Himself the burden of this calling. And it was with His baptism that His office began.

Not unannounced was He to enter upon it, nor were His people to be left unprepared. It devolved upon the Baptist both to introduce Him to His people and to prepare them to receive Him. The symbol of preparation was the baptism of John. This baptism even Jesus partook of, thus submitting to the will of God, as it concerned, and was expressed to, the then existing generation of Israel. But it had as widely differing a significance in His case, and that of others, as His person and office differed from those of all other men. What was to others a preparation for an entrance into the kingdom of grace, was to Him a preparation for manifesting this kingdom. For His baptism by John denotes not merely a stage in the progress of His Messianic consciousness, but an actual operation of God upon Him. It was not merely a declaration of His willingness to enter upon His office, and to undergo those sorrows which He well knew to be inseparable therefrom, but it was, at the same time, an endowment for this office by the Spirit of God.

It has been asked, How should He need endowing with the Spirit of God if He was conceived by the Holy Spirit? Does not the one exclude the other? But this arises from a misconception of the distinction here found. As there is in our case a difference between our becoming children of God by the regeneration of the Spirit, and our being fitted for the service of God by the gifts of the Spirit; so too in the case of Jesus, that operation of the Spirit which originated



His earthly life and formed the bond of the personal communion of the Incarnate Son with the Father, was different from that which referred to His miraculous endowment for His office, and thus rendered His human nature capable of its part in the Divine work of salvation.

He was not, however, to enter upon His office until He had been proved by *temptation*. As the first Adam was to advance towards his future through temptation, so too was the second Adam. The former succumbed to temptation, the latter triumphantly withstood it. As, moreover, the temptation was in the case of the first man an external occurrence, so still less can it, in the case of Jesus, be transposed into the sphere of His inner life. For if sinful thoughts had arisen from his own heart, the pure mirror of his soul would have been obscured thereby. The temptation of Jesus was an unparalleled event, even as He was an unparalleled man, and the history of His life was decisive of the ancient conflict carried on throughout the history of mankind between the two kingdoms—the kingdom of God and that of His adversary. Just when He was standing on the very threshold of His ministry, and the whole future which lay before Him was crowding upon His thoughts, there was presented before Him also, in a tempting and seductive form, the caricature of that future which existed in the carnal Messianic notions current among the Jews of those days, and which were often brought near to Him during the course of His official life, for the pur-

pose of leading Him astray into these God-displeasing paths. This is the signification of this occurrence. The longer period of temptation which He had to experience did not close with the three temptations which are especially narrated. All three were designed to induce Him to forsake, in a self-seeking sense, the path of His calling. To make a selfish misuse of the miraculous power with which He was endowed, to rely for selfish ends upon the promised mighty aid of God, selfishly to seize upon that future sovereignty of the world which was decreed Him, instead of receiving it from the hands of the Father,—these were the three temptations which were to put in the place of a Saviour after God's own heart, a Messiah after the heart of the carnally-minded people. (<sup>3</sup>) Jesus by repelling in this temptation the seduction of seeking to attain the end of His office, not in the way of suffering, but in that of enjoyment and honour, decided His future. It was when he returned to the Baptist from the temptation in the wilderness, that the latter hailed Him as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world (John i. 29).

This was His entrance upon His office.

His *prophetic office* is delineated by the evangelists in their various pictures of His life. It was His words which were the power of His work. Of all powers on earth, the powers of mind are the greatest. Their effect is often apparently eclipsed by the power of physical agencies; but the results of external force, brilliant as they may often appear, fall, sooner or later,

under the inexorable law of mutability, and often scarcely a trace remains of what caused perhaps astonishment and admiration to half a world; while a breath of eternity dwells in the silent work of the mind. The kingdoms of the world crumble to pieces; but an eternal kingdom is built up by the world of mind. To this the victory is promised. The true kingdom of mind is the kingdom of God, and its soul is religion. Christ came to found an eternal kingdom of religion by the power of his word.

And what kind of religion did He preach? He did not merely proclaim a religion of free-thinkers, as is thought perhaps in France; nor transfigure Judaism into Greek humanism, as is stated by the German schools of philosophy; nor did He merely intend, as certain theologians seem to understand Him, to set before us the ideal of human nature; but He preached *the grace* of God. All the before-mentioned explanations omit one matter, and that the chief—they leave sin out of the question. But the sin of man needs grace. It is this which we want. If Jesus was to be *the* prophet for mankind, He could not but preach grace. And who that knows His words, as the evangelists have reported them, does not know that He is the preacher of Divine grace? This is the atmosphere which pervades His every word—the secret of His power over the minds of men. He speaks indeed of the kingdom of God, but it is the kingdom of grace. There is nothing more touching than such calls of tender persuasion as: ‘Come unto me, all that are

weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' And that which so moves us in them, is that tone of grace proceeding from the heart of God, and penetrating to our hearts. His crowning parable—if it is lawful so to speak—is surely that famous parable of the prodigal son; and the whole parable is nothing else than the powerful preaching of grace. Nothing more marvellous can be read than the beatitudes with which the Sermon on the mount commences; but it is the voice of grace which speaks to us in these wonderful words. The preaching of Jesus is the preaching of grace.

This preaching of Divine grace and of God's kingdom of grace was the truth which mankind had so long been seeking.

*“Du den wir suchen auf so finstern Wegen  
Mit forschenden Gedanken nicht erfassen  
Du hast dein heilig Dunkel einst verlassen  
Und tratest sichtbar deinem Volk entgegen.”*(\*) \*

Israel had its prophets and Greece its philosophers. Jesus is the object of prophecy, and therefore its end, and His word the higher truth of whatever knowledge of truth præ-christian philosophy may have possessed. What the former beheld at a distance became reality in Him. and what the latter sought in its paths of error became truth in Him. In Himself, in His Person, appeared the saving word of God. Hence He could call Himself the Truth. But He is the revelation of truth be-

\* Thou, whom we seek in paths so dark, and whom we cannot grasp with our inquiring minds, didst once leave Thy holy obscurity and visibly present Thyself to Thy people.

cause He is the revelation of grace. The error of heathen philosophy lay in seeking truth by means of knowledge, and regarding the realm of knowledge as man's ultimate object, while truth is not a knowing but a being, and its realisation a right relation to God. And this appeared in Jesus. Israel possessed the prophecy thereof, Jesus brought the fulfilment. He is Himself what He proclaims, and brings in Himself what He teaches; He takes of His own, that which by His word He dispenses to His disciples. The distinctive feature of His teaching is that His Person is its guarantee. Hence, what we are taught by Him, we are taught about Him. And they who understand Him attain to an entirely different understanding of God and the world, of man and his destiny, they know that God in Christ is our Father, and the world the theatre on which He manifests Himself, that man is destined to be a child of God, and a subject of the kingdom of God, which is advancing over the sorrows of time to the perfection of eternity. This kingdom of grace it was which His mouth proclaimed.

But it is also the spirit of *holiness*, of the strictest, the most inexorable holiness, which addresses us in these words of seeking and saving grace. For such is the nature of God. God is love, but holy love. If Jesus is the revelation of God, He must be as truly a revelation of the Divine holiness as of eternal love—of both in one. Neither by respect of persons, nor regard to consequences (*e.g.*, Luke xiv. 26, 33), can He be induced to abate aught of the strictness of His

demands. Let the circumstances be what they will, the hearers whom they may, His word is the same to all. Even when they are His mother and His brethren, He recognises nothing but obedience to His word (Mark iii. 23), and reproves even the foremost of the apostles in the same terms as He reproves His enemies (Matt. xvi. 23). Not even when many of His followers secede from Him, as at the critical period, a year before His death, does He relax one word of the seeming harshness of His speech. Even though the cause He is advocating should seem to be ruined thereby, even should it cost Him His life, He abates not one jot of His unrelenting demands, He makes not the slightest concession to the sluggishness of will and carnality of mind which characterise the nation. We might sometimes be tempted to call His pure words inconsiderate, if we did not feel, through the apparent harshness of their form, the deep sorrow of His soul, when He knew that His words would have a repelling effect, and could yet abate nothing from them. This wondrous combination of love and severity, which is at once so touching and surprising, is the effect of that spirit of holiness which breathes in His every word, and pervades His every action.

It was this holiness which brought about *the catastrophe of His life*. This world would not have been the world of sin it is, if the phenomenon of His life and teaching had not stirred the minds of men to their very depths, and aroused all that hatred of truth which slumbers in the human breast. <sup>(5)</sup> It is a



delusion to think that truth will meet with approval for its own sake, that it will ever gain the masses in this sinful world. There does, indeed, exist in the soul of man a sense for truth, but there co-exists also an opposition to truth, and the latter is the stronger of the two. It is true that Christ did meet with love,—with love faithful unto death,—but He met with still more hatred. From His first days till His last, both the love and the hatred increased together. But the hatred was the mightier; and, at least outwardly, it triumphed. I know not what could be more humiliating to our race than the fact, that such love as was manifested in Jesus could produce and call forth such hatred as fell to His lot, and that such heavenly purity should become the mark against which all the passions of men should combine. If anything could make us despair of human nature, it would be this fact. To despair, indeed, it should not lead us, but to humble and serious reflection upon what must be required to win to God a nature capable of such deeds. And let it not be said that this was done only by the Jews. With Jewish fanaticism was combined heathen want of principle. And who can assert that his own nation would better have stood the test? What was done to Jesus was but the culminating point of what has been the experience of all ages. The witnesses for truth have ever been its martyrs. It was His testimony to truth which cost Jesus His life; and the Prophet was a martyr to His office.

But His death was more than a martyrdom : it was *a sacrifice* for the sin of our race.

It was not enough merely to proclaim grace : He had also to obtain it. The way to the grace of God is a way of sacrifice. Between us and God stands our sin ; and sin can only be removed, and the way of access to God opened, by an atoning sacrifice.

All religions have sacrifices. <sup>(6)</sup> In them is expressed the universal need of reconciliation, and the acknowledgment that the way to reconciliation is propitiation, and the means of propitiation, sacrifice. This is a fundamental principle in all religions, and the central point of all worship. Whatever we may think of the fact, we are compelled to admit it, and its universality compels reflection. However much of error may have been mingled with it, some notions of the truth must have been the foundation of this religious custom. Certainly we find in it a sad perversion of truth. Men thought to earn the favour of the Deity by the gifts they presented. This was the heathen error, reprov'd in the strongest terms by the prophets of Israel (comp. *e. g.* Michah vi. 7, &c.) It is true that in Israel, sacrifice was an ordinance of God, and had therefore an atoning significance. But how could the blood of animals take away sin ? Hence the heathen world sought to make vicarious atonement by human sacrifices. Human sacrifice made the tour of the world, and continued down to the very latest period of præ-christian heathenism, even among the classic nations. <sup>(7)</sup> Our hearts turn with loathing from

this horrible custom. And yet even in this extreme distortion a true feeling is expressed—the deep feeling of guilt and the painful craving for reconciliation. Israel did not practice human sacrifice—the occurrence on Moriah, when Abraham was on the point of offering his son, was, to the Israelite consciousness, a protest against it. Its place was to be supplied by that future better sacrifice, offered by the obedience of Him who was to be the fulfilment of all the desire of the heathen world, and the realization of all the hopes of Israel. His sacrifice both sanctioned and abolished all the sacrificial worship which preceded it. This sacrificial worship, however, teaches us that the religious craving of man has in all ages regarded reconciliation with God as the chief element of religion. If Christianity then is to be the absolute religion, it must be the religion of reconciliation. For it must bring the accomplishment of what all others were seeking. The præ-Christian religions were prophetic of Christianity; their sacrifices a prophecy of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. We cannot understand sacrifice till we survey it from the height of Golgotha. And what sacrifice, studied and understood from this point of view, says to us, is, that a guiltless life must make expiation for the life forfeited by sin. Now, we know that this was really effected by Christ. He compensated for the debt we had incurred; He became the sacrifice for our sins. This is the central point of the whole system of Christian doctrine.

But was this sacrifice *necessary*? Its necessity is

involved in God himself; for God is both holiness and love. As the Holy One, He hates sin, and is angry with the sinner; as Love, He desires his salvation. As the Holy One, He desires to know nothing of the sinner; as Love, He desires to know him happy. As the Holy One, He is his judge; as Love, He would be his deliverer. As man really is, He is angry with him; as He thinks and wills Him in His eternal counsel, He loves him. Love and wrath oppose each other in God, and each demands its right. It is true that love finally triumphs over wrath, for love is that which is eternal in God; but it triumphs only in the way of holiness, that is, in the way of atoning sacrifice.

It has often been asked: Cannot God forgive unconditionally? <sup>(8)</sup> Why is an atonement needed? We answer: Can God deny Himself? Can He cease to be the enemy of sin and its judge? Even if He could cease to be such, our conscience would not cease to demand it. A law of righteousness exists in our conscience, without which our conscience would cease to be conscience. It is this which requires a propitiation. If sin could be unconditionally forgiven, we should lose all confidence in our moral consciousness. It would be false love in a father towards his son to ignore his transgressions as though they had never existed. We should perplex and destroy the moral consciousness of our children if we were at once, and unconditionally to forgive; the transgression must first be expiated. This is required by the moral system of the world, which is not an act of Divine

*fallacy lies in that 'Forgiveness =  
transgression as though it had*

arbitrariness, but the expression of the nature of God Himself. <sup>(9)</sup> For the nature of God is a moral one and consequently His love is moral also. Only when it is in harmony with the Divine Holiness, is love even morally possible to God. And the holiness of God requires that transgression should be expiated.

But how is this to be effected? Not by future amendment. For to be good and to act rightly being at all times no more than we are bound to perform, no previously committed transgression can be obliterated thereby; and before the guilty child can render the obedience of joyful love, he must already be assured of forgiveness. Not till then is the weight removed from his mind, and the condemnation from his conscience, which it chains. Before, however, it can receive forgiveness, it must have experienced sorrow for sin in its consequences. The way of forgiveness is a painful one. I must learn what my sin really is. I must feel, and painfully feel, it in its consequences; not till then can grace reply to my prayer for forgiveness by pardon. God cannot unconditionally pardon, cannot unconditionally do away with sin, lest it separate us still farther from Him. Sin must accomplish its results; we must painfully experience them. We painfully experience the consequences of sin as the deserved punishment of sin. Only in the way of suffering can sin be expiated. <sup>(10)</sup>

But the sinner himself cannot furnish the true atonement; for he continues a sinner in God's sight. He must first cease to be a sinner, if he is really to



make restitution for sin. Only a guiltless one, appearing as a substitute for the guilty, is capable of offering the true atonement. Christ became an atoning sacrifice for us, for He became at the same time our *substitute*.

It is a universal notion of man's moral consciousness, that the guiltless must appear for the guilty. Even in the heathen world we meet with presentiments of this great truth. The greatest tragedians of Greece, when they have drawn the knot of the moral conflict as tight as possible, loosen it—Æschylus, in the legend of Prometheus, Sophocles in that of Œdipus—by the notion of substitution. <sup>(11)</sup> What was in them the faint twilight of presentiment, became truth and reality in Christ. He became the substitutionary sacrifice for our sin.

But can there be a substitution where, as in this case, moral guilt and its punishment are concerned? Can one appear and make satisfaction for another? Is substitution *possible*?

The idea, or rather the fact, of substitution pervades every grade of human life. The husband is the head of the house. He thinks, he provides, he works, or at least he ought to work, for the whole family; he appropriates its weal and woe, the conditions and wants of the whole, and of each individual; and that not externally only, but so that they form a part, or at least ought to do so, of his own life. And again: as the whole family is comprised in him, so also does all that affects him extend to all the other members. All share in his position, his honour or dishonour. That



which touches him touches all ; all suffer for any evil he may commit, and his moral nobleness ennobles all. What is true of the husband is not less true, in her measure, of the wife and mother. That which makes the mother truly such is, that she bears in her own heart the weal and woe, the joy and sorrow of the members of the family, as if they were her own personal experience. It is this inward appropriation, this soul-felt sympathy, this most real heart-bearing which makes her the soul of the family, in whom the manifold emotions of the family life find their place of union and repose, and from whom a refreshing atmosphere of peace is breathed forth upon all. And what is true of the family is equally true of every community. Every community requires a bond in which it may find its unity ; a head to represent it, to appear as its substitute. And this substitution, when it is of the right kind, is not merely a natural, but a moral relation. In so far as any one heartily appropriates the interest of a community, and makes it a part of his inner life, does he become its representative. It is he who incorporates the idea of the society, discharges its office, bears it in his heart ; he lives the life of the whole, and the whole lives through him. This law extends even to the individual. None serves another, none truly helps another, who does not mentally put himself in his place, and take his wants into the very life of his own heart. We may say that all love is of a substitutionary nature, for it ever makes the interest of another its own. There is a substitu-

tionary acting, and there is a substitutionary suffering in all love for others, in which love, both outwardly and inwardly, does, in a certain sense, take upon itself that which falls upon another, and thus appear for him. <sup>(12)</sup>

It was a saying of Aristotle, that all noble-minded men are inclined to sadness. <sup>(13)</sup> It is not merely the feeling that their own lot is a hard one which oppresses them ; it is something more—it is their inward sympathy with and consciousness of participation in the sufferings of the human race to which they minister. Selfishness alone can dissolve the inward bond of union with others, and say : ‘ What is that to me ? ’ Love inwardly unites us to another, and makes his joys and sorrows our own. And the more Divine the love, the more does it do this. The more noble the man is—the more the spirit of love, which is from God dwells in him—the more does he take the sorrow of the whole race into his own soul, bear it in his own heart, and thus undergo it in his own experience. We may say that there never was a truly great man in whom this trait of substitution was not found. For true greatness consists in love, and love makes that which is another’s its own. When the prophets of God, in the Old Testament, bewail and reprove the sins of their nation ; when we perceive by their words how their souls are pierced with grief for their nation, it is because they know and feel themselves to be one with it, and because instead of looking upon its sins and sorrows as something foreign to them, they appropriate them to themselves. It is everywhere love

which forms this bond of fellowship, which places even the guiltless in the rank of the guilty, because he belongs to them, because he chooses to belong to them.

Now, in Jesus perfect, absolute love appeared, and that for all. He belongs not merely to His nation; He belongs to mankind. He enters into intimate union with the whole race. It is comprised in Him, for it finds in Him its aim, its head, its representative. He is the Son of Man. Thus does He also gather into His large and loving heart all the sorrows of humanity, and all its suffering—the suffering both of sin and guilt. From the beginning, so soon as His consciousness developed, He knew that in Himself the threads of human history met; that He was to conclude the old and begin the new era; that He was the Son of Man. And what He knew Himself to be, He also chose to be—chose it from the very bottom of His heart. He identified Himself with mankind. He could say, I am mankind. In Him their history was to be accomplished.

All progress, however, is effected by suffering; every step in advance requires sacrifice. For that which is new cannot appear until the debt of the old is paid. Because our path is one of sin and debt, it is also one of suffering; for as every act entails its own results, so also do human sin and guilt involve their proper consequences. These consequences must ensue. Not till then can the old be surmounted and the new begin. This is a demand of Divine justice,

and a postulate even of our own conscience. If the threads of our history are all united in Christ, if our race is comprised in Him, if He is the turning point of our history, the path of its progress, the path by which it is to advance, He must also submit both externally and internally to all the consequences of our sin and guilt, and suffer them to be accomplished in Him. He must take upon Himself the whole burden of our guilt and its consequences ; bear them, suffer for them, and experience the feeling of them in His inmost soul. In this way was He to effect our deliverance. For this is the way of moral necessity. We must be justly and righteously, not arbitrarily saved ; for arbitrariness is not moral. Truly it is love that saves us ; but it is the love of the Holy One, who bears in His very nature the law of moral necessity. And this moral necessity requires atonement in the way of suffering—the bearing and atoning for the consequences of sin. For this reason, then, did Christ become the vicarious sacrifice for our sins, that He might thus become the Reconciler and Redeemer : ‘ God made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him ’ ( 2 Cor. v. 21 ) ; *i.e.*, God imputed to Him, and visited upon Him, our sin, which was not His own, that He might then impute to us His righteousness, which is not our own. He bore the consequences of our sin.

The consequence of sin is the *wrath of God*. To speak of the wrath of God is perhaps to express ourselves in human fashion, but what is meant thereby is

not human. For God would not be holy love if He were not angry with sin. God loves only what is like Himself ; He loves in us only His own image ; He loves us as He willed us to be. It would not be loving us as He willed us to be, if He were indifferent to the marring of His own image in us. Sin is this marring of His image ; sin is opposition to God, is denial of God. God would not be what He is if He did not deny the sin which denies Him. This is the wrath of God. It is not a passionate, not a hasty wrath, after the manner of men, but the opposition of His holiness to the sin which opposes it. His wrath is the obverse of His love. No man truly loves holiness, and advances in the way of holiness, unless he hates and opposes sin,—at least the sin that is in him,—and is angry with himself, the sinner. But God is the absolutely Holy One, and this He could not be if He had that false tenderness which is incapable of anger. His wrath is that result of sin which finds an echo in our own consciousness ; and to this result of human sin Jesus submitted.

It was this that He bore from the time of His incarnation, throughout the whole course of His life on earth, till the overwhelming fact of His death.

His very entrance upon this life of pain and sorrow was itself a consequence of our sin ; and so, moreover, was His work. For it was, indeed, a work of suffering which he undertook, from the temptation which He had to repel at its commencement, throughout all the misconception and enmity He endured, and which

extorted from His soul the sigh of complaint, down to His last hour, in which sorrow upon sorrow was heaped on His head. In all this He was bearing our burden, the consequences of our sins.

But it was in *His last hours* that all which had been preparing during His whole life was accumulated. And how am I to speak of these? No words can give even a remote idea of the momentousness of this subject. Allow me very briefly to direct your attention to the important facts.

It was night when Jesus left the city to go out to Gethsemane, where His last suffering and the conflict of His soul began. He had but just before called Himself the vine, as bearing and supporting by His strength those disciples who cleave to Him in love and faith, as the branches do to the vine; and now it is He who seeks comfort and assistance, at least the comfort of their society, and finds Himself deserted by them. It was the first, it was the only time in His life that He sought alleviation at the hands of man. At other times it was He who called men to Himself with the promise: I will refresh you. ‘And out of His fulness’—says the apostle—‘have all we received grace for grace.’ He now seeks refreshment from men, but they all forsake Him. He is alone, heart alone too, without one to help Him, without one to understand or even faintly to conceive what He has to go through.<sup>(14)</sup> This sorrow of being forsaken, of being alone in the wide, wide world,—this sorrow, too, was added to the inward anguish of His soul. We all know that Jesus



was not wont to use mere empty expressions. We may have the habit of choosing to express our feelings in terms which far exceed the measure of our actual sensations. We know this, and are accustomed to make allowance for it in what we hear said. It ought not so to be; but so it is. With Jesus,—as we all know,—this was not the case; He was truth itself, even in His slightest expressions. When He, then, complains to His disciples: ‘My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death;’ when He says, in these words, that His heart is ready to break with sorrow and anguish—what a flood of woe and agony must have rushed in upon Him!

And what was it that made Him thus inwardly quail? It was the path of suffering He had to tread, the death which stood before Him. Yet how strange is this! Many have met death fearlessly, and why should not He?<sup>(15)</sup> I speak not of those who have deadened their feelings and hardened their hearts against the truth of the fact. There is an indifference to death into which men can delude themselves. But he who desires to be true cannot but own that death is the king of terrors; and he who does not own it, either has his feelings benumbed, or is untrue to himself. Of such I am not speaking. Yet how many martyrs have met death joyfully, and praised God for it! while Jesus offered strong crying and tears to Him that was able to save Him from death, as the epistle to the Hebrews informs us (Heb. v. 7). But Jesus was more than a martyr. Terrible as death may be to

us, it is yet, as we are now constituted, a natural event. We bear it within us from the very first, and have deserved it. With Jesus it was the absolute contradiction to what He was. For He was the Life itself, the Prince of life; and it is the greatest of all conceivable contradictions, that the Life itself should be delivered to death. It was, indeed, that by passing through death He might open the path of life, but still by passing through death. He was in absolute communion with the Father; and it is the greatest of all conceivable contradictions that He, the Holy One, who was in eternal and indissoluble communion with the Father; should deliver Himself to the dark power of death, and the prince of death—a power hostile to God. It was, indeed, that by this very means He might restore us to communion with God, but yet it was by this means of separation from God. This was a tearing asunder of the inmost nature of Jesus Christ. Which made His very heart tremble.

But it was more than death. He saw in spirit, and felt beforehand, how the sin and wickedness of the whole world were combined in what was done to Him. The whole dark depths of our sinful heart, the whole abyss of our soul's dark passions, were here brought to light. The old contest between good and evil, which had been going on throughout the whole course of history, was here comprised in its full force and utmost severity. If we would know what is in man, we must learn it here. It is here that we may estimate what we are capable of, for it is vain to try

and except ourselves. Jesus Christ is indeed to us not an object of hatred, but of love. But He is so only because He has borne the hatred of our race. That we now occupy so different a relation towards Him, is a fact which has been brought about since, and brought about by Himself. What we see in the history of Christ's passion is a picture of our heart, such as it is when left to itself. Israel and the heathen world joined hands in the deed—the high priest and the Roman governor, the nation of religion and the nation of universal dominion ;—we might say: Church and State were there banded together by common hatred against the Holy One of God. That which so moved Christ, was that in the fate which He underwent He had to encounter the whole extent and power of sin ; that mankind, whom He loved as never man loved, should be capable of answering such love with such hatred ; that evil should have such power over human hearts.

Nor was it this only, for underlying all was the will of His Father. It was this which was exposing Him to this ungodly violence ; which was, in all this, laying upon Him and causing him to bear the doom of sin ; which was punishing our sins by His sufferings, in order thus to expiate them ; which was letting Him suffer, not merely through the sin, but for the sin of man. It was this which made His anguish so sore, that His heart was nigh to breaking ; and for this He had but one remedy, the knowledge which He gained by prayer of the necessity of this suffering. Not

merely the knowledge of its external inevitableness. Such knowledge may produce resignation, but not acquiescence; it may lead to surrender, the surrender of the conquered, but cannot conduce to victory. It was on the contrary the knowledge of its inward necessity, the necessity involved in Divine love, which alone could help Him through the heavy trials of the succeeding hours. This knowledge, and the acquiescence it produced, made Him victorious, the knowledge that the cup could only pass away from us by His drinking it; that sin could only be atoned for by his paying its penalties—paying them by Himself experiencing what sin really was; and that these very consequences of sin were through His willing obedience to become the causes of restoration. (16)

He went to meet the traitor, and gave Himself into the hands of those who were sent to arrest Him. He uttered before the Sanhedrim that confession which condemned Him, the confession that He was the Son of God, and chose rather to be silent before His secular judge than to say anything which might increase Pilate's fear, and save His own life. Thus did He make what He underwent His own act and deed, and when 'He might have had joy,'\* chose *the cross* (Heb. xii. 2).

The ingenuity of man has ever exhausted itself in the invention of torture. Crucifixion is one memorial

\* 'Da er wohl hätte mögen Freude haben,—erdultete er das Kreuz,' etc. (Heb. xii. 2).—*Luther's translation.* 'When He might have had joy, He endured the cross,' etc.

of this sad ingenuity. It was introduced into Rome from Carthage, and into Palestine from Rome. It was a combination of the most painful tortures. Only slaves and malefactors of the lowest class were thus punished. On this occasion, it was inflicted upon Him who was the Holy One of God, the manifestation of Divine love. Israel demanded this punishment, and a heathen power was the instrument which executed it.<sup>(17)</sup>

For six hours did the Lord hang upon the cross and endure its sufferings. Heaven, as the narrative relates, covered the sad scene with a veil of obscurity. Never shall we succeed in raising the veil which conceals the mysterious sufferings of Christ's soul during these hours. But it is overpowering to behold that even then He was love—interceding, pardoning, considerate love. He prayed for His enemies; He proclaimed pardon and a share in the kingdom of God to the thief on the cross; He committed His mother to the disciple whom He loved. He was, to the very last, the manifestation of love. He manifested love even when He experienced none from either man or God. For, as far as His own feelings were concerned, even God had deserted Him. It was indeed an indissoluble tie which united Him to the Father; and even now, when all the waves and billows of God's wrath were going over His head, He was still the Son of His love. But what His heart felt was not love, but desertion. The hardest times in the lives of believers are those when God seems, to their inward perception, to have withdrawn Himself; when they cannot but think them-



selves forsaken, and say: 'I sought Him whom my soul loveth; I sought Him and found Him not.' And yet what takes place in our case is but a faint echo of the reality which He experienced in its highest degree. We cannot pass through the same experience; we are incapable even of explaining it intelligibly; but we can form a notion of how He felt, from that cry of His anguished heart: 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?'

'Surely,' says the prophet, when, more than seven hundred years before the event, He describes His sufferings as though he were himself standing at the foot of the cross,—'surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed' (Isa. lii).

God is greatest when His condescension is greatest. Divine love could not descend to lower depths than thus to plunge into this extreme consequence of our sin; to receive this suffering into its own inward and essentially Divine life; than that God should thus appropriate what was ours, in order that we might be possessed of what was His. This act of love has ever since been the joy of Christians, and the cross their confession.

To the ancient world, the cross was the symbol of shame; to us, it is our joy, our comfort, and our boast.

There is nothing which could possibly be more opposed to all our natural ideas than the cross. W



can understand a God of majesty ; we can comprehend a manifestation of God in great human geniuses ; but nothing could be more directly opposed to our every notion, than that the death on the cross should be His supreme manifestation. 'To the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Greeks foolishness,' says the apostle (1 Cor. i. 23). And so it is still. And yet it was just the preaching of the cross that conquered the world. In proportion as concessions are made to the repugnance of the natural reason to the cross, is Christianity weakened and its efficacy lessened. It is only the Christianity of the cross which is the victory over the world. And it has conquered. A few years since a drawing representing the Crucified was found upon the walls of the ancient palace of the Cæsars in Rome. The rude sketch speaks to us from the times of the struggle between Christianity and heathenism, and is a memorial of the manner in which the minds of men were then stirred. Some heathen servant of the emperor is taunting his Christian fellow-servant with this contemptuous sign. The relic belongs to about the year 200, and is by far the most ancient crucifix we know of. But this, the oldest known crucifix, is an ironical one. It is a caricature of Christ, before which a Christian stands worshipping, and it bears the inscription : 'Alexamenos' — the name of the derided Christian — 'worshipping his God.' <sup>(18)</sup> We see that the crucified Saviour and the preaching of the cross were the scorn of the world ; and yet this conquered the world. In the great

struggle between heathenism and Christianity, the cross was the sign of victory. Whether the story is true or not, that Constantine, before his decisive battle with Maxentius, saw in the clouds of heaven the appearance of a cross, with the inscription, 'By this shalt thou conquer,'—even if it is a fiction, it is yet truth in the form of fiction, for the cross was the power that conquered; and such it will remain. If Christianity is to conquer the world, it will only do so as the preaching of the cross, and not by concessions to the natural reason.

It is contrary to all natural logic that God should humble himself to such an extremity. That death upon the tree of shame should be His supreme revelation is contrary to all the logic of the natural reason. But it is the logic of love; and love can hold its own against the logic of the mere understanding, for it has on its side the higher logic of truth.

Wondrous paradox! The sign of deepest shame has become the sign of dominion and of consolation. The cross now stands upon the high places of the earth; it is a mark of honour and of graceful ornament among men; to Christians it is the point, the place around which their thoughts gather, and where their hearts meet. If we would truly understand God, we must make the cross our starting point, for it is here that His holiness and His love are forever united. If we would have communion with God, we must seek it at the cross, for it is here that judgment is executed on the sin which separates us from God.

and here that the love is manifested which unites us with Him. So long, therefore, as there are Christians on earth—and that will be to the end of time—their confession will be: He who died upon the cross is my Beloved.

Now, however, He is seated on the throne of His majesty, and to this subject I shall proceed next time I address you.

## LECTURE VI.

### THE CONCLUSION OF THE WORK OF REDEMPTION AND THE TRINITY.



IN our last lecture we accompanied the Lord Jesus to His death upon the cross ; let us now accompany Him from the depth of His abasement to the height of His glory to His throne of sovereignty.

In His death, the contradiction running through His whole life, the contradiction between His eternal nature and His historical reality, became as great as was possible, without destroying the unity of the Divine life itself. This contradiction required a solution in a state of life in which His historical reality should be one with His nature and its corresponding expression. Ever since sin came into the world, the law of its moral constitution has been that humiliation is the way to exaltation, and that the tension of contrasts leads to harmony of existence : *per crucem ad lucem*, through the cross to the crown. We all hope for a life of glorification and enlightenment, where the contrasts of this existence will be resolved in harmony. But the road to this future state leads through death, through this greatest tension of oppo-

sites. We know, however, that beyond death lies eternal life. The pledge of this assurance is Jesus Christ. He died in order to rise again to a perfected life of glory. This is the reconciliation of the contrasts exhibited by His earthly existence. From this point it is that a light is thrown both backwards and forwards; hence, everything relating to Him turns upon His *resurrection*, which is the foundation of Christianity.

There is, however, hardly anything which has been so much the object both of attack and defence, in the religious conflicts of the present day, as the question of Christ's resurrection. For it is the decisive question. If Christ is risen, then is His life, then is His person, a miracle; if he is not risen, then He stands within the limits of the natural, and Christianity is a production of the natural intellect.

The resurrection has been denied upon doctrinal grounds. Criticism—it is said—must explain everything naturally. This is a vital point in criticism; hence, Jesus cannot have risen. We must not—it is said—exact from our race, and from modern consciousness, a belief in a miraculous Christianity, for this would be a contradiction to modern consciousness. <sup>(1)</sup>

But Christianity is a contradiction to nature such as it is in consequence of sin; and Christ is a contradiction to the natural man such as he is in consequence of sin. It is true that Christ is the truth of man, but only because He is the rupture with the old

man. Now, what is true of Christ is true of Christianity. It is above all a judgment upon merely natural reason. Only in this way is its higher truth manifested. He who would expunge the paradox of Christianity, expunges Christianity itself; and he who will have no Gospel which is foolishness in the eyes of the natural man, will have no Gospel at all. He who thinks to help Christianity to conquer the world by giving up its miraculousness, cuts through the very sinews of its strength. It is not by the way of concessions that it has conquered the world.

The resurrection has been denied upon both dogmatic and philosophic grounds. But the question is one of history, not of philosophy. It concerns a fact, not a view. Facts cannot be overthrown by arguments and views, but only by the adduction of historical evidence. Let us first, then, establish *the fact*.

Certain women, as the evangelical narrative tells us, were the first to behold the risen Saviour. For the purpose of completing the work of embalming Him, which had been interrupted by the Sabbath, they went at day-break to the sepulchre, which lay just outside one of the gates of Jerusalem. The spot now regarded as the locality of the Holy Sepulchre, has every probability in favour of its genuineness<sup>(2)</sup>. They found the grave empty, and forsaken by the keepers, with whom the hatred and suspicion of the Jewish authorities had surrounded it. Struck by this unexpected fact, they first saw angels, who reas-



sured them concerning the fate of their beloved Master, and afterwards Jesus himself. St. John tells us further, that it was Mary Magdalene to whom the Lord first appeared, but with a direction to her not to cling to His sensible presence but to carry to His disciples the news of His resurrection. Peter and John went meantime to the grave, and left it in perplexity. The message of the women found no credence among the disciples, but was regarded as the result of their excited imagination. In this sense it was spoken of, as St. Luke relates, by the two disciples when, on their road to Emmaus, a place some miles off, they poured out their full and troubled hearts to the companion who joined them, in words which sound like a wail of despair—until they recognised in their companion Jesus himself, who vanished as suddenly as He had appeared. Full of this wonderful event, they hastened back to the other disciples, who received them with the joyful news that Jesus had already appeared to others, and especially to Peter, to comfort him, who had denied his master. While they were thus talking together, Jesus unexpectedly stood in their midst, convinced them that He was alive,—alive in the body, and yet different from what He had hitherto been. These appearances were moreover continued; vanquishing the doubts and perplexity of Thomas, and raising the disciples to a faith in the invisible nearness of their risen Lord. The Jews, moreover, explained the strange fact of the empty grave, by the subterfuge that the corpse of

Jesus had been stolen by His disciples. St. Matthew, in his gospel, openly accuses the Sanhedrim of bribing the keepers to spread this fable.

Whatever then we may think of this fact, one thing is certain : the disciples believed in the resurrection of Jesus.

The disciples believed in the resurrection of Jesus. With this faith they went out into the world, with the assurance that they had seen and had intercourse with the risen Saviour, they conquered and converted the world, and for this faith they suffered death. This is a fact which no one controverts, which no one has yet controverted. The only question is how this fact is to be explained. <sup>(3)</sup>

Was it a delusion ? Did the Lord after all not really die, but only fall into a trance, and, reviving after a short interval of *apparent death*, go forth from the grave into life again ? Such is the way in which the older rationalists got over the difficulty, and which even the penetration of Schleiermacher did not disdain to adopt. But it was an impossible one, and the acute criticism of Strauss has made it for ever such. It may certainly have happened once, or even several times, that a crucified man was taken down from the cross before death, and his life saved by the most careful attention and medical skill ; but that one who had suffered those mortal agonies during six hours, and had revived from His death-like exhaustion—that such a one, with His broken strength, and with that deadly weakness which would utterly prostrate Him, and make

the most anxious care necessary, could give His followers the impression that He was a conqueror over death and the grave, and enkindle within them a joyful assurance of victory, and a certain hope of a better life, and raise them at a stroke out of the darkness of mourning and doubt to the joy of a world-conquering faith—to accept this as truth, is not common sense, but folly.

A revival from a state of trance being then insufficient to explain the faith of the disciples, perhaps their own *notions* may account for it. Did not their faith, that Jesus was the Messiah, require the resurrection as its necessary consequence, and thus gradually lead them to the supposition that He had really risen? This is the modern plan for getting over the difficulty. But how is this possible? The logic of the disciples did not run thus: Jesus is the Messiah, therefore He must rise; He must rise, therefore He is risen; and therefore it is believed that the risen Saviour has been seen and spoken with. On the contrary, their logic was—as appears from St Luke's narrative of the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 21): Jesus is dead, therefore He cannot be the Messiah; nor were they re-assured of His Messiahship until they were assured of His resurrection. Scripture testifies that it was not His Messiahship which was a reason for belief in His resurrection, but His resurrection which was a reason for the belief that He was the Messiah (*e.g.*, Acts ii. 33, 36). Even if the resurrection of Jesus was a fiction of His disciples, originating from their

own reflections, this at least would be certain, that such a revolution in their thoughts and frame of mind could not have taken place in a few days, and that external facts of some kind would even then be needed.

This is admitted, and so this intrinsic change in the thoughts of the disciples is helped out with certain occurrences. The aid of *Visions* is appealed to. The disciples did not see their risen Lord; they only believed they saw Him. Their excitement was so great as to amount to imaginary visions. The women began; the men followed suit. How, then, did it come about? Because the grave was empty? The grave was certainly empty on the Sunday morning. How came it to be empty? And what notion could be more natural to the disciples than that either the Lord had risen, or that His body had been taken away? Mary Magdalene at least, of whose state of enthusiastic ecstasy so much has been said, only came to the second and more sober-minded conclusion (John xx. 13). And even if the women saw visions, what about the men (Luke xxiv. 22)—these men of active life, these fishermen of Galilee, with their sound sense and strong nerves? And those ‘five hundred brethren,’ to whose testimony St Paul appeals (1 Cor. xv. 6)? and the whole Christian Church of primitive times, than which no body of men could be further removed from the visionary condition and phenomena of a morbidly excited state of nerves? It is impossible. And then the Apostle Paul? The most desperate efforts have been made to do away with his testimony. He has

been represented as the subject of nervous disorders, of epilepsy !<sup>(4)</sup> As though it were not a still more difficult task to explain how so essentially sound a mind, and so blessed a work as his, could proceed from so diseased a source. And how, too, is the phenomenon which he himself presents to us to be explained? Nothing was more opposed to his notions. His vision of the Lord was no fruit of his inner development; it was a sentence of condemnation upon his whole past life. Like the thunder of God, it struck him to the earth, and overthrew his whole Pharisaic theology. His former world was laid in ruins, and a new one dawned upon his mind. A man would surely know whether such a turning point in his life were a real event or a dream. It was a fact which decided him. From that time he became a preacher of the risen Saviour, and the resurrection was to him the foundation of the whole Christian faith, and the proof of it. 'If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished' (1 Cor. xv. 17, 18). No one can speak more decidedly or unmistakably. If the resurrection is a delusion, then Christianity, at least the Christianity of the apostles and of Holy Scripture, is a delusion, and a new one must be invented. But this is needless, for if any one fact of history is certain, it is the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

And that not only on historical, but also on *internal grounds*. If Jesus himself is an exception to rule, why should rule be appealed to against the resurrec-



tion ? (<sup>5</sup>) On the contrary, both His person and His work require it. His person : for it was necessary that His condition of life should correspond to what He really was. Resurrection was but the necessary consequence of His earthly life. For how should the lot of Him who was the life itself, terminate in death ? and the life of Him who was the eternal Son of God, end in the grave, and far from God ? He could not have been what He truly was, had He continued in the state of death. Death was the contradiction to His person. Hence death was forced to yield to that new order of life which His person required. And His work : for this was atonement and redemption, and our faith in the atonement is not Divinely authorised till God by this fact proves it to be our atonement. The resurrection is the proof by fact, on the part of God, that sin is forgiven. And redemption is is not perfected until the power of death is overcome in His resurrection by the victorious power of life. This has ever since been the foundation of our hope.

The resurrection of Christ, then, is certain : not merely on historical grounds ; but equally so on internal grounds.

But the Christian creed continues with the words : *'He ascended into heaven. He sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty.'*

Jesus Christ rules the ages. He has become the ruling power of the world and of its history ; and that not merely in the sense of general intellectual power ; for we do not mean merely that the spirit of



Christianity as combined with the intellectual life of mankind, rules the world. It would then be no power of inward renovation and moral regeneration. Neither have we to deal with the influence left behind by the person of Christ; an influence which, propagated from generation to generation, by the vibrations of that vital power which proceeded from Him, is thus communicated to every individual who comes within the radius of its agency. <sup>(6)</sup> Christ is not merely a past greatness, but a present living power. When He took leave of His disciples, it was with the words: 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' He is gone to God, that He may be near to us. He has cast aside the limitations of space, that He may be everywhere present. He departed from the circle of His disciples, that He might be with His Church at all times and in all places. Christianity is not a mere subject or system of thought, not a code of morals, but a personal relation—the personal relation to Jesus Christ. For Jesus Christ is not the Mediator who once procured through His mediation our communion with God: He continues to be our Mediator. He will not make Himself superfluous, nor does He desire to be so considered. Our communion with God is ever caused by His present mediation. This is Christianity. And every Christian knows that progress in Christianity is a progress in personal relation to Jesus Christ. We may be certain, that in so far as we are indifferent to Jesus Christ, so far are

we retrograding as Christians ; for so far are we at a distance from Him. For He will be near to us, only that we may be near to Him.

His departure from earth marked the commencement of a higher kind of presence, a higher order of agency. He rules the ages ; and He will rule hearts.

All *history* must serve Him. The first impression made upon every intelligent observer, by the course of the world's history, and also the deepest meaning which the most penetrating research can discover, is that all things, great and small, are tending towards one end—an end not laid down by man, but one which is in the hand of a Higher Power, the end of the Kingdom of God and of Christ. For what reasonable man doubts that Christianity will yet become the universal religion ? And what else does this mean, than that every knee shall bow in the name of Jesus Christ ? All things subserve this end, evil as well as good—the progress of the human intellect no less than the triumphs of morality. The Divine government of the world stands at the service of Jesus Christ ; it is He who loosens the seals of the future.

But it is not merely in the aggregate of mankind that His work is being carried on : He concerns Himself no less with the individual ; for He dwells not merely in the world and its history, but first of all in the heart and in the inner spiritual life of the individual. It is here that He desires to dwell and to work ; and the work which He carries on in the

individual soul is to bring that salvation which He made an historical fact to the world, and which He completed and deposited in His own person, into the heart of each individual, and to make it a fact of his spiritual life.

But this is an operation carried on within the province of our spiritual life, and, therefore, a spiritual operation—an operation of spirit upon spirit. Hence Christ carries on this work by His Spirit, called in Scripture the *Holy Spirit*. As Christ fulfilled the will and work of the Father upon earth, so does the Holy Spirit administer the will and work of Christ in the human soul. What Christ effected in the world of history, the Spirit inwardly appropriates and brings into the inner world of the human soul; for this has been the office of the Spirit of God from the beginning.

The Holy Spirit is frequently spoken of even in the Old Testament. He there appears as the power of Divine life, producing life in the world—life natural and intellectual as well as moral; for it was He who, as Scripture represents, in the beginning animated the earth, so that from it proceeded the manifold forms, whether of the vegetable or animal kingdom. It was He who called forth the intellectual life of man, and who is ever its origin and cause. It was He who awakened in the prophets their higher knowledge, and in the saints their moral affections. Thus He everywhere implants in the world the life of God, and forms the bond of communion between God and the world.

But since the blessing of redemption, the new life of grace, has been achieved, and brought near by Jesus Christ, it is His office to convey this new life into the souls of men, and to enable them to appropriate the salvation offered them in Christ. This has been the office of the Holy Spirit since the work of Christ was finished. (7) Hence He forms the bond of communion which unites the souls of men with God and Christ, and binds our hearts in faith and love to our Redeemer. For communion with Christ does not consist in externals, but is an inward relation. It is not forms and formulas, not certain practices and external ordinances, which make us Christians, but the Spirit of Jesus Christ dwelling in our hearts and ruling our thoughts and desires. The præ-Christian era sought religion in external forms and practices. We know that its home is in the heart, and that its essence consists in the love of the renewed heart to God, who is eternal love. A new era for man's spirit began with Christ. For it was in the depths of the human spirit that He implanted the word of His truth, and into the most secret chambers of the soul that He cast those cords of love which unite us to the eternal world. The mystery that He revealed was that mystery of the heart of God and of His eternal love, which can only be understood by the human heart and its love. But the interpreter of the mystery of God to our spirit is the Holy Spirit and it is by Him that the mind of Christendom is roused, the life of Christendom excited.

Christianity has conquered the world—the world o

mind and of thought, as well as the world of morals and of public life. But its mightiest triumph is its conquest of hearts. It is in this agency upon the soul that the *Divine work of salvation is completed*. The history of salvation is like a stream flowing through the ages. It rises in the ancient times of the Old Testament, with its prophets and heroes; flows onwards through Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Golgotha; but it is ever tending towards the heart of man, and it is there that it must empty itself, for it proceeded from the heart of God, and eternal love is its source. As the rivers of earth arise amid the dark and silent recesses of the lofty mountains, so, too, the stream of our salvation had its origin in another world, in the silent mystery of eternity, whither no glance of the human mind can penetrate, and of which no human tongue can bring us information. But that which was born of the counsel of Divine love, in the bosom of eternity, rushes down from those everlasting heights into time, and traverses its broad plains, till it arrives at that silent haven of all life which we call the human heart. Here, in the silence of the soul, in the unfathomable mystery of the inner life, in the solitary chambers of the heart, whither no eye can penetrate, and to whose deepest feeling the tongue shuns to give expression—here it is that the eternal purpose of the Divine love and its history become an inward experience; here it is that it finds its resting place. Here, too, it does but collect its forces, that it may begin its course anew, and pour forth fresh streams of



life, which shall at last find their end in that eternal world, that world of glory, that world of God's children, their eternal rest upon the heart of God.

‘O the depth of the riches!’ exclaimed the apostle, when his mind was overwhelmed by similar contemplations (Rom. xi. 33, etc.),—‘O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever!’

When, then, we would sum up in a few words the faith which we confess, we say: *I believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* For the meaning of our faith in the Triune God is, that we acknowledge the God who has revealed salvation to us,—a salvation whose history begins and terminates in the heart of God, and in the glorified world of renovated humanity.

When Jesus, before His departure, gave commandment to His disciples to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (Matt. xxviii. 19), He comprised in these three names the whole revelation of salvation, in which the mystery of God has been disclosed; and when we designate believers in Christ as believers in the Triune God, we confess thereby faith in that God of love who has been manifested in the work of redemption. It is from this point of view that *the Trinity* must be understood.

But can it be understood? Are we not all far from understanding it? Is not this notion of the Trinity an impossible one? Truly, the very word



is, so to speak, preceded by rumours of the difficulties which accompany it, and of the internal contradictions which forbid us to reason on it. For how, it is asked, can the part be equal to the whole, or one to three? And yet the greatest minds, from Augustine to Leibnitz, have believed in and investigated it. Rationalism, indeed, with its superficial criticism, rejected the dogma as nonsense. But Christianity must be strangely constituted if, when its chief fundamental dogma contained nothing but a palpable offence against the simplest mathematical or logical propositions, it could have continued to publish this as the most important of religious truths for more than a thousand years. Hegel confronts rationalism with this objection,<sup>(8)</sup> and recent philosophy now finds in this very doctrine the expression of its profoundest ideas. It is true that it misapplies to its own purpose the meaning of the dogma; which it has nevertheless brought into favour again. And however slight a value may be set upon the authority of great minds, this much at least is certain, that this doctrine cannot be delivered up without farther ceremony to the jurisdiction of the multiplication table. Certainly one is not equal to three; but only misconception could find such an assertion here. Does the nature of God belong as much to mathematics as the figures of a sum?<sup>(9)</sup> Has not every nature its own laws? If we say of God that He is One, do we speak of the bare and empty unity of a mere numeral? Is there not such a thing as a unity which includes within itself all fulness? Should we attain to an adequate

knowledge of the nature of the free and rational soul of man by regarding it merely according to mathematical laws? But God is greater than the human soul, and is removed far beyond any standard which our intelligence can furnish. Can we, then, wonder if the fulness of the Divine nature should not submit to the limits of our thought, and should overflow the banks of our powers of expression? It is but natural that, by reason of this disproportion of our reason and its forms to the subject in question, difficulties should arise, and doubt and scruple be produced. From the time when I began to think, the first youthful doubt of which I was conscious was concerning the doctrine of the Trinity; and my last thoughts will certainly get no farther than did those of Melanchthon, who comforted himself upon his deathbed with the hope that, in the world to come, he should be acquainted with those mysteries of God which, in this life, he had been incapable of comprehending. And how long has the incomprehensibility of any subject been considered a proof of its non-reality? If it were such, the limits of reality must be extremely narrowed. If it were such, God himself would be non-existent, for He will ever remain incomprehensible.<sup>(10)</sup> ‘God dwelleth,’ as the apostle says (1 Tim. vi. 16), ‘in the light which no man can approach unto.’ And if God is incomprehensible, why should not that distinction in His life, which we designate by the name of the Trinity, be so too?

One of the greatest minds that ever lived was

Augustine. For a whole millenary did the West derive its mental nourishment from him; and at the present day we are still his scholars. Great part of his powers of mind were devoted to the investigation of this mystery, and whatever has since been philosophically taught or thought concerning this doctrine has been chiefly a mere treading in his steps. He was one day—so tradition relates—wandering by the sea shore, lost in thought, and meditating the plan of a work on this doctrine, when he saw a boy playing and making a ditch in the sand. When Augustine asked him what he was doing, ‘I want,’ he said, ‘to empty the sea into my ditch.’ ‘And am I not trying to do the same thing as this child,’ said Augustine to himself, ‘in seeking to exhaust with my reason the infinity of God, and to collect it within the limits of my own mind?’

We are not obliged to understand a matter perfectly, in order to feel certain about it; nor need we be able to refute all the objections which may be urged against our faith, in order to be relieved from perplexity concerning it. Do we not all know how much easier it is to question than to answer? There is another kind of certainty than that of the understanding. One need not be a great theologian to be a good Christian; and the possession of great scientific knowledge is not necessary to the possession of truth. The greatest theologian knows no more truths necessary to salvation than the simplest Christian; he is only, perhaps, better able to prove and defend them.

Nevertheless, in every Christian, faith is pressing on towards knowledge, and truth has a tendency to become the possession of the understanding as well as of the heart. The lazy ignorance which does not care to give a reason for anything, and the learned conceit which thinks itself able to explain everything, are both equally reprehensible.<sup>(11)</sup>

How, then, are we to understand the doctrine of the Trinity? It is not a mystery for scholars, but the creed of Christians; not wisdom for the initiated, but a fundamental article of faith for all. 'I believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' In these words is comprised the whole of Christianity. But Christianity is not for the aristocratic circle of great minds, but for all people. It is not philosophy, it is religion; and religion is, or at least ought to be, the most popular thing extant. And so, too, should the doctrine of the Trinity. It is no philosophical theorem. It may be that it conceals within it depths which the profoundest speculation may in vain seek to fathom; but it must be, at the same time, that plain truth which the simplest Christian is able to grasp. Christian truth has often been compared to a river, in which an elephant might be drowned, and which yet a lamb might ford.<sup>(12)</sup> The doctrine of the Trinity is the fundamental article of Christianity. Now Christianity is, the religion of redemption. Hence this doctrine is no proposition of philosophic speculation, but the *expression of our faith in redemption*. Hence, too, the prae-Christian era knew nothing of it, for it knew

nothing of redemption ; and left to itself, no cogitations, no reflection of the human intellect could ever have attained to it. But when redemption was accomplished, this truth was self-evident. When the Lord was risen, He spoke of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and the disciples asked him for no explanation. In the facts of redemption the mystery of God had been disclosed, and in this saying concerning the Triune God, they beheld the facts of redemption. Thus it became to them the expression of Christianity itself.

The modern view—as advocated *e.g.*, by Strauss—which makes Christianity result from an intermingling of Judaism and Heathenism sees, consequently, in the doctrine of the Trinity an expression of this combination of Jewish monotheism with Heathen polytheism. This view, however, is no less in opposition to history than to the matter itself. For the circle in which Christianity found its birth-place came in contact neither with heathen notions of religion, nor heathen philosophical speculation, and the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is not the dilution of heathen polytheism, but its opposite. It is true that traces of this notion are found in the most opposite religions, and not merely in the Indian Trimurti of Brahma, Siva, and Vishnoo. But they are expressions not so much of the inner life and nature of the Deity as of the process of natural life. The saying that the number three is the signature of Deity may perhaps be called a thought common to all nations, and an appeal made in its favour to the *consensus gentium*.<sup>(13)</sup>



God is indeed reflected in the mind of man. But such a reflection is far from giving the knowledge of the Trinity of God. The philosophy of Plato has been thought to have struck out a path to this doctrine, and certainly no ancient philosopher so nearly approximated Christianity in his speculations as Plato did, nor was his influence unfelt either in the elaboration of orthodox doctrine, or in the circle of thought occupied by heretical teachers. The roots of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity are not, however, to be found in the Platonic philosophy. Far removed from it, is also the idea of so unreserved a revelation of God, as we possess in Jesus Christ, who could say: he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father. From this revelation of God in Christ, did the knowledge of the Trinity arise.

Undoubtedly, when God steps forth from the darkness which conceals Him, and is about to reveal Himself to man, He is ever preceded by presentiments of the human mind as His forerunners. Yet these are but shadows of things to come—creations of the mind without reality. It is the acts of the self-revealing God which first give these empty notions substance. Thus, presentient ideas of the Triune God were already stirring in individual minds. The wisdom of God, the word of God, were spoken of; <sup>(14)</sup> but they were unsubstantial shadows without flesh and blood—the product of the human intellect. The knowledge of the Triune God Himself, it entered into no heart or thought of man to conceive. This knowledge was no discovery



of the human mind, but a revelation of the Divine love. It was not till God revealed Himself as the Triune God that He was known as such. It was not till He revealed Himself as Father, Son, and Spirit, that He was acknowledged as Father, Son, and Spirit. And this too, must be our way to the knowledge of Him. It is in His revelation that we too, must find the Triune God.

We must begin with Jesus Christ, if we would be certain of the Trinity of God ; with the knowledge that Christ was the revelation of God ; that in His intrinsic and eternal nature He is one with God ; and that the Spirit of Jesus Christ, who works in our souls, is the Spirit of God himself. God has revealed Himself to us in this distinction of Father, Son, and Spirit ; and our faith rests upon this threefold revelation, and sees in it the revelation of one and the same God. And when we profess our faith in the Triune God, we name the one great historical drama of redemption. The circuit of revelation terminates in the Divine Three. What the Father demands, the Son performs ; and what the Son effected, the Holy Spirit appropriates to us. The Father sends the Son into this our world ; the Son atones for our guilt, and reconciles us to God ; the Holy Spirit makes us the children of God, and produces the new life of love in our hearts. It is upon this threefold act of God that our salvation ever depends, and it is an act of one and the same God. For what the Son has done for us, and what the Holy Spirit effects within us, is all the act of that same God

who from eternity willed our salvation, and in the fulness of the time accomplished it. He accomplished it, however, under the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and of this threefold revelation. We do but profess a belief in our salvation, in the acts by which He effected our redemption, when we profess our belief in God as the Triune God. This was Christ's meaning when He made this confession the fundamental confession of His Church. It is not a speculative view of the nature of God which we are to express by it, but our faith in the redemption which has been actually effected and is constantly being brought to pass by this revealed Triune God.

But the revelation of God is the mirrored reflection of His nature. God would not be the Triune in the history of His revelation, if He were not such in the mystery of *His nature*. The work of salvation would not have been accomplished in a triune manner, if the inner life of Love did not itself exist in a triune manner. By the same steps by which the Deity descended from His secret dwelling into time and its history, does our mind ascend to the heights of the Divine mystery, and venture a glance into the hidden abyss of His nature. The one God includes within Himself a fulness, in whose variety the process of His life of love is accomplished; and yet throughout this distinction of Himself, the unity of His nature and His life is maintained. But who can fitly speak on such a subject? They are indeed but stammering words that we can utter. We speak of three Persons

in the Divine nature. It is an utterly inadequate expression ; but we have no other for it. All our words are derived from human relations, and are insufficient to express the Divine. We are but too conscious of the inadequacy of language, when we seek to apply it to the mystery of God. For, designate it as we will, our designation must still remain an insufficient one. What we want to say is but this ; that the unity of God is not a simple but an effected one ; that God's inner life of love is carried on by an inward self distinction of God ; that this eternal distinction in God includes within it the whole Divine nature, so that God is in this sense a Triune Being ; and that then this eternal Trinity, as we call it, set itself in motion, and entered into history to realise therein the eternal counsel of love.

In the doctrine of God, Deism and Pantheism are two errors in mutual opposition. Under spurious forms the former advocates the bare unity, the latter the fullness of God. The former separates God from the world, and views Him as abstract greatness without vitality, the latter confounds Him with the world, transports the world and its life into God, and makes the life of the world the life of God Himself. The one extreme calls forth the other. For, just where God is regarded as inactive unity, the need of a living God leads to the filling up of this empty greatness with the life of the world. Islamism, which inculcates the bare abstract unity of God, is ever accompanied by Pantheism. The mysticism of Mohammedanism is pantheistic.<sup>(15)</sup> Both these errors are averted by the know-

ledge of the Divine Trinity. God is not bare solitary unity, but the living self-filled One. And it is not the life of the world, but His own life, which constitutes His intrinsic fulness. God is not lifeless repose, but ever living activity; not mere passive being (*Sein*) but active being (*Werden*). And this His active being is manifested in His triunal modes of existence. These are the outcome of His eternal and active being. Into this, His inner life, God's loving will received the world, and placed His Trinity in relation with the world. In the Son, God willed the world and man; in the Spirit, He unites the world and man to Himself. The Son is the eternal copy of the Father; at the same time, the world's prototype and end. The Spirit is the hidden bond of life of God the Father and God the Son, and at the same time the living bond which unites the world with God. The Father is the eternal reason of all things, the Son is their prototype and end, the Spirit, the ever present power of their existence. As the relation of God to Himself and the course of His inner life is ever fulfilled and concluded in the distinctions of Father, Son, and Spirit, so, too, is the relation of God to the world ever fulfilled and concluded therein. Thus the doctrine of the Trinity leads us rightly to distinguish between God and the world, and yet to connect each with the other. It averts both Pantheism and Deism, because it is the higher truth of both. But the higher it is the more must we acquiesce in the distance at which it is placed from the contact of our thought.

The attempt has been made to render the mystery of three persons in one Divine nature more easy of comprehension by means of *the analogies of the human mind*; for since God made us in His own image and likeness, we have a right to think of God after our image and likeness—as the supreme prototype of our own mental life. It was that great Church father, Augustine, who first struck out for successive ages the path on which their speculations on the Trinity afterwards advanced. The notion may be nearly thus expressed: As our mental life is exercised and fulfils itself in the acts of knowing and willing; as our mind does not exist without knowing itself and willing itself; and as in each of these acts of our mind, our whole mind is present,—so also does the eternal life of God fulfil itself in the eternal acts of knowing and willing. God knows Himself eternally; God wills Himself eternally. The result of these Divine acts is those distinctions in God which we designate as the three persons of the Godhead. The Son is the eternal self-thought of God, the result of His knowledge; the Holy Spirit is the eternal love of God, by which God wills Himself. For before God knows and wills the extra-Divine, the world and mankind,—this imperfect copy of God,—He must know and will Himself in His perfect counterpart, for He alone is the worthy and adequate object of His own knowledge and love. These acts of the Divine life are, moreover, no transitory notions or emotions, as in our case, but abiding acts, which also really suppose their object. God, by know-



ing and willing Himself eternally, supposes Himself in His perfect image. Thus, then, God is hereby involved in an inward self-distinction. He who knows is distinct from the self that He knows, while in His love He gathers Himself again into unity with Himself. This is the method of explaining the mystery of the Trinity from the nature of God, which has been familiar to the Church from ancient times, and on which all the variations of this explanation are founded ?<sup>(16)</sup>

But let us not forget that these are but attempts at explanation, which, though they may have their value, do not form the foundation of our faith. It is not upon the notions of human wisdom, nor upon the changing forms of human speculation, that our faith rests, but upon the facts of the external and internal history of salvation. God has, in the history of salvation, revealed Himself, in a triune manner, as Father, Son, and Spirit ; and we, in that work of appropriating salvation, through which we become Christians, have experience of God according to this distinction,—viz., as Him to whom we are reconciled, as Him through whom we are reconciled, and as the Spirit who has inwardly appropriated to us the grace of reconciliation, and made it the power of a new life to us. Thus do we become certain that there are distinctions in the Godhead, that God is the Triune God. He, the Triune God, it is, who cherished in His heart the counsel of our salvation ; He, the Triune God, who, in the history of mankind, effected this counsel of His love ; He, the



Triune God, who manifested His love to our hearts, and made us the children of His grace. In Christ, God ever eternally willed to love us; in Christ, God redeemed us in time; in Christ are we the children of His love for eternity. It is only in Christ, and not out of Christ, that we have the God of salvation. Out of Christ God is the consuming majesty, before which no man can endure. They who would know and find God, the God who is eternal love, the reconciled God, the God of grace, can find Him only in Christ,<sup>(17)</sup> not out of Christ; but to know, to find, to possess Him in Christ by faith, love, and hope, this—we confess it—is not our work, but the work of God the Holy Spirit. The Triune God alone is perfect love, and the revelation of the Triune God the perfect revelation of love.

Hence, because the God of Christianity is perfect love, and Christianity the revelation and proclamation of this love, the God of Christians is the Triune God, and all Christian knowledge of God the knowledge of the Triune.

It is no speculation which we thus express, no mere notion of God which we entertain, but it is the confession of the faith which saves us. To say: God is Triune, is to say God is the God of redemption; to deny the Trinity, is to deny redemption; to acknowledge the Trinity, is to acknowledge redemption. Christianity is the religion of redemption; hence its central point is the confession of the Triune God. It has ever been such in all Christian Churches on earth.

This confession receives us at our entrance into the world, at our Baptism ; we make it when we are admitted into the congregation of communicants by confirmation ; it is the expression of our faith when our Christianity becomes a conscious fact of our inner life by conversion ; and that future knowledge which we hope for, those disclosures of eternity which we long for, will all centre around the theme ; I believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

## LECTURE VII.

### THE CHURCH.



THE Church is to form the subject of my present lecture.

In the apostles' creed, we say : I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church. The doctrine of the Holy Ghost, who concludes the work of salvation effected by the Triune God, is immediately succeeded by the doctrine of the Church ; for the Church was the first work of the Holy Ghost.

It is not enough to acknowledge God in the work of creation, nor even in the work of redemption : we must also acknowledge Him in the work of sanctification,—that is, in the Church ; for the Christian creed confesses the Creator, the Redeemer, and the Holy Ghost. Atheism denies the Creator ; Deism denies the Redeemer ; Rationalism denies the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church. There must be a desire to find God, if we are to discover Him in creation ; for creation conceals as much as it manifests Him. There must be an eye for true greatness, if we are to see in Jesus Christ and His redemption the revelation of God ; for His form of a servant seems to be a contra-

diction. And even so it is with the Church: She bears the heavenly treasure in an earthen vessel, and there must be spiritual eyesight to discern the presence of God in her. But they who are willing to see and hear, find God to be in her of a truth.<sup>(1)</sup>

Whatever we may think of the Church, this much is at least certain: it is *a fact*. And what a fact! Let it be our first endeavour to bring it clearly before ourselves.

Even if we regard the Church as only a work of the human mind, and not a creation of the Divine, we cannot but acknowledge that it is the most wonderful of works. Outwardly regarded, it is an association of mankind; an organism of intellectual life; an institution in which religion has found her home. We are accustomed to combine Church and State in our thoughts, and they have a certain relationship to each other; they are the largest social circles of human life. But where is there a State which can compare with the Church for the antiquity of its existence or the elasticity of its life? How many storms have passed over the Church! She has survived them all! Nations and kingdoms have disappeared from the earth; the Church has remained. She saw the last days of the Roman empire; she stood at its grave and bestowed upon it a parting blessing. She stood at the cradle of the German empire, and has taken her share in the varied events which have befallen it; she accompanied it upon its pilgrimages and crusades, and assisted in the arrangement of its domestic relations;

she saw the days of its greatness, shared its days of tribulation, and has survived its downfall. Nothing of the ancient German empire remains except the dream of our youth, and the hope of the future; but the Church still is what she was at the time of the coronation of Charles the Fifth. The change of times has indeed affected her. The alterations which human society and the human mind have undergone, have caused alterations in the Church. She has been drawn into the stream of history, and has allowed herself to be carried away thereby; but she has remained the same. Her forms have changed, her appearance is altered, but her nature is ever the same; and her creed is what it was in the days of the apostles. It is the one same Triune God whose salvation she proclaims, with whose consolations she comforts, and to whom she calls the nations, as to a sure refuge in the tempests of the ages. She has suffered losses, but she has also made conquests. In Asia Minor and Northern Africa, where there were formerly flourishing churches, the crescent and barbarism are now triumphant. But she has gained the nations of the future—the west of Europe, and the countries of the West. She has experienced many attacks; but she is, as Theodore Beza says, the anvil upon which all hammers have been broken. The stormy waves of Moorish conquest in the South were broken when they dashed against her; the hordes of the Huns and Mongols in the East at last bent to her, or disappeared before her. At times, it has seemed as if the evil deeds of her

children must destroy her, but she has been more powerful than the sins and crimes of her unworthy representatives. The spirit of negativism has opposed her, and appeared victorious, but she has repulsed the attacks of unbelief. She has oftentimes been pronounced dead, yet still she lives. So long as fourteen hundred years ago, in the time of Augustine, it was said that she was expiring; but to-day finds her yet alive.<sup>(2)</sup> In the age of Voltaire and Frederick II., her decease was expected; but when the name of Voltaire is forgotten, she will yet exist. At first she was reproached for her youth, now for her age;<sup>(3)</sup> but she possesses an eternal youth. She seems to have been thrust aside by the intellectual progress going on in the world; but when the wonderful progress of our age shall have made the whole earth one great city of the human race, it will be seen that men have only been preparing a place for the Church. 'Wondrous, unparalleled, nay, Divine is it,' exclaims Pascal, 'that this Church, which is ever being attacked, has ever endured.'<sup>(4)</sup> And wondrous, too, is it, that Christ predicted this fact: 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it' (Matt. xvi. 18.)

The Church is a fact; and what a fact! All must at least acknowledge that, of all institutions on earth, she is the most venerable, and that, at all events, it is impossible not to feel respect for her.

And yet, at the present day, an *antipathy* to the Church prevails in extensive circles. It is not, perhaps, always confessed, but still it exists. It



clothes itself, perhaps, in the garb of external respect, but under this is concealed the most utter indifference; and the soul of this indifference is aversion. Aversion to the Church is concealed perhaps by a pretended interest in Christianity. When, however, this is not hypocrisy, it is a delusion; for the Church is the body of Christianity, and Christianity is the soul of the Church. No one, then, can be on the side of Christianity who is not on the side of the Church.

What then is said against the Church? She is reproached for being indifferent to temporal interests and intellectual progress, and for want of participation therein. Certainly she does not undertake the care of worldly interests, nor labour directly for the intellectual progress of the natural man; but then this is not her office. And I should have thought that it would be a matter of rejoicing to those who had men's real interests at heart, that there is a society on earth with another object than that of attending to the matters of natural life, and which is a constant memorial that there is something higher than this temporal life, and that the life of the soul in God and in eternity is of far more importance than all the progress of the human intellect. But is the Church an enemy to the matters of natural life, because the care of them is not her immediate vocation? Has not religion been, in all ages, the bearer of civilisation? Modern French scholars have made it their special task to show the connection in which the progress of civil society stands with religion. <sup>(5)</sup> It is not merely

that she has introduced into the world a spirit of love, and taught that to minister to the unfortunate is the most acceptable worship ; <sup>(6)</sup> she has also modified the severity of law, and founded the happiness of society upon benevolence. She has preceded the nations in their emigrations, as Edgar Quinet says, like the pillar of fire. And all the attainments of modern culture have their roots in our faith, and in our notions of God. What the heathen Plutarch says : ‘ You might more easily build a city in the air than give permanence to a State without a religion,’ <sup>(7)</sup> applies to us also. But to speak of religion is to speak of the Church ; for the Church is religion organised. And history confirms the fact that the Church has ever been the most powerful element in the civilizing potency of Christianity.

Just imagine the Church banished from the world. Such a state of things is predicted ; the State of the future is, it is said, to be without a Church and without religion. <sup>(8)</sup> Well : let us conceive the Church banished,—for it is an impossibility to us to conceive it non-existent ; it is far too closely interwoven, not only with our outer, but with our inner life, to let us even imagine it not to be—but let us try to suppose it gone, and what would be the consequences ? The least of these would be, that the noblest instrument of intellectual culture would be lost. For—let us not be deceived in this matter—our nation derives its noblest culture from the Church. It is by her that the mind is fed with the sublimest thoughts, the most

magnificent images, the purest poetry, the most elevated aspects of art. Our nation would suffer an irrecoverable loss in the whole province of its intellectual life. Nor let it be thought that this would befall only the lower classes and the masses of the people. We know not by how many thousand threads our whole mental life is interwoven with the Church and dependent upon it. We do not generally learn adequately to value a possession till we have lost it, and such would be the case in this respect also. But the intellectual loss would be the least result. The moral surpasses the intellectual life. Well : let the churches which occupy in our towns so many a costly site, which might be better bestowed, be demolished, and what would be the consequence? It does not need much reflection to say, that for every demolished church we should have to erect a prison, for each church forms a hearth whence a moral influence is diffused throughout its neighbourhood. If the churches were no more, we should soon feel that a moral force had vanished from our life ; for the mental and moral forces of life are greater than its material ones. In short, they who look upon things with only worldly wisdom cannot but own that the Church is a necessary moral institution, which nothing else can replace, and that it would be the most short-sighted economy to try and save here. But all who truly know the Church know that she is not only this, but something more : the proclaimer of God's grace, the dispenser of Divine comfort, the counsellor of the erring, the consoler of

the afflicted, the source of moral strength, a blessing to the living, a blessing in death. Whence, then, this wide-spread antipathy to the Church ?

She is reproached with *intolerance*. Toleration is the triumph of modern times, and the Church—it is said—sins against this progress of humanity, for she allows nothing to be truth but her own dogmas : she declares the way of salvation which she announces to be the only one, she thus denies salvation to all who do not agree with her ; she delights in condemnation. This is what is said of her. Is it true ? What is her preaching ? and what is her behaviour ? The subject of her preaching is the grace of God in Christ Jesus for all—the grace which desires not to condemn, but to save. And her action is unwearyingly to proclaim this in all possible forms, and to bring it near to all men, that they may let themselves be saved by God's grace. Nor does it content her to announce this word of grace, and to carry on this work of saving souls within her own limits ; wherever there is life in the Church, there is also the missionary work of bearing, far beyond the boundaries of the Church, to those poorest of the poor, the heathen, the message of God's fatherly love as manifested in Christ Jesus. Her office and her work recognise no barriers of nations or tongues. Let it be candidly said, whether it is a spirit delighting in condemnation, or a spirit of love, which is here manifested.

But it is asserted : the Church is nevertheless intolerant, for she professes herself to be the sole possessor of

truth, and her doctrine to be the sole way of salvation. If this is intolerance, then truth is, by its very nature, intolerant, *i.e.*, exclusive ; for every truth is the denial of its opposing error ; and He who is absolute truth, *i.e.*, God, says : ‘ My glory will I not give to another, nor my praise to graven images.’ If Christ had a right to say : ‘ I am the way, the truth, and the life’ (John xiv. 6), then the apostles had a right to say : ‘ Neither is there salvation in any other’ (Act iv. 12). And if the Church is the announcer of the truth of Jesus Christ, she must hold this language also. As Christ said of himself : ‘ No man cometh to the Father, but by Me’ (John xiv. 6) ; so must the Church say of it, *i.e.*, of the faith in Christ which she preaches : No man cometh to the Father but through it ; that is, she must maintain the exclusiveness of her truth, or she is denying it.

Let us be quite clear about this matter. If the Church were to demand unique and exclusive privileges in the world of civil life, she might be justly reproached with intolerance ; but when she ascribes to herself exclusive truth, in the world of faith, in the question of the soul’s salvation, she is only doing what she cannot help doing so long as she believes in herself ; and, when she no longer believes in herself, what right has she to exist at all ? (9)

We boast of freedom of conscience. But to whom are we indebted for freedom of conscience ? Its first advocates were the first preachers of Christianity. Heathenism terminated in doubt and fanaticism,—a

fanaticism which Christianity experienced, for the very right of existence was denied her. ‘*Non licet esse vos*’ was the watchword in the battle waged against her in her youthful days. <sup>(10)</sup> Doubt was allied with this fanatic intolerance, for doubt cannot suffer pretensions to absolute truth to exist. The philosophic scepticism of the heathen world could not endure that unphilosophic Christianity should declare itself to be supreme truth, and intolerant doubt replied to this exclusiveness of truth by persecution. Christ said: ‘I am the truth;’ and Pilate asked: ‘What is truth?’ In the one case we see exclusiveness, in the other scepticism. But on which side was persecution—on Christ’s, or on Pilate’s? It is an erroneous, though a widely spread notion, that scepticism is tolerant, and that belief in the truth makes a man intolerant. <sup>(11)</sup> I admit that religion has often served as a pretext for intolerance; that not only false friends, but her own ministers, have practised cruelty and intolerance in her name. But how can religion help being misused, does the misuse of a thing do away with its lawful use? It is said: Persecutions arise in the name of religion; let religion be done away with and persecutions will cease. Might we not as reasonably say: Conflagrations arise by means of fire; let fire be done away with and conflagrations will cease? Certainly they will, but then men will perish with cold. <sup>(12)</sup>

If truth is to be possessed, it must maintain itself against error. If it were to treat error as of equal authority with itself, certainty would no longer exist.



To declare everything equally true means to declare everything equally false, and nothing certain; and this would be not charity, but cruelty; for we need truth, we want certainty. We owe truth to ourselves and to others. We forfeit our right to conviction when we have none. They who have convictions are certain of their truth; and they who are certain of truth cannot but deny its opposite. They who value their own opinion no more than its opposite, are indifferent about truth; and to be indifferent about truth is not a virtue, but a crime. Scepticism is not strength, but weakness of mind. To be unable to arrive at any certainty, through mere doubts, is the mark of a race in a state of degeneracy and decay. The old world finished with scepticism, and was ruined by it. Christianity began with certainty, and triumphed thereby. To be tolerant through doubt does not denote elevation of mind, but is a sign of degradation and a forerunner of ruin. Moreover, if we can really declare it a matter of indifference to us whether we are Christians or not, why, then, should we be Christians? If we can be all things, we are nothing. As long, therefore, as the Church believes in herself, her declarations must be exclusive. But if she no longer believes in herself, how can she require faith in others? And if she can no longer venture to do this, what is the use of her?

What, indeed, it is said, is the use of her? The Church is *superfluous*. The history of the Church is the history of her gradual dissolution. There is a

time for all things. The Church has had her day, and the signs of the times declare that the Church's day is over. Well, this has often been said before, and the Church has survived the advertisements of her death. And if the announcement is renewed at the present day, it does not look as if the Church will really do these prophets the favour of dying.

But perhaps our opponents separate Christianity from the Church, and say: 'Christianity is not to cease, but it will cease to exist in the form of the Church.' In what form, then, is religion to exist? Is it to be the affair of the State? The State belongs to an entirely different province of life. The State administers justice; the Church announces Divine grace. The State ministers to temporal life; the Church ministers to eternal life and the salvation of souls. Every province of intellectual life requires its appropriate organism. The State cannot be the organism of the Church.

Or is religion to be relegated to the heart and to the private life of the individual?

It is true that religion has its inmost dwelling in the heart of the individual. But man was made, not for solitude, but for society. He may occasionally flee from the distractions of life, or the corruptions of society, and take refuge in solitude, but he cannot endure it for ever, nor ought he to do so. Man was made for society. Minds seek each other; souls unite with each other; and when the same religious life exists in many, it will combine them into a com-

munity possessing religious life. This is a law of our nature, and a necessity of our earthly existence. But the Church is a community possessing religious life ; so long, therefore, as this is not superfluous, *i.e.*, never, the Church will not be superfluous.

Having now considered the fact of the Church's existence, and the grounds on which it has a right to exist, we will proceed to the consideration of *its nature*.

The Church is, as has been said, an association possessed of religious life. But it is not merely a human association, it is more : it is a creation of God, a work of the Holy Ghost.

The birth-day of the Church was the day of Pentecost, the festival of the Holy Ghost. The Book of Acts relates the foundation of the Church by relating the sending of the Holy Ghost into the hearts of the disciples. You are all acquainted with the narrative (chap. ii.). The Holy Ghost—for this is the meaning of the account—inwardly renewed the hearts of the apostles, and bestowed upon them all needful gifts for the ministry of the Word, thus becoming the power of their new life, and the inward bond of their association. Thus did the Church originate—as a creation of God, as a work of His Spirit. What, then, do we learn from this? That it is not external forms and customs, but the Holy Ghost that makes the Church really the Church. He is the soul that fills and animates her, and combines all her individual members into the unity of one body.

Externally viewed, indeed, the Church consists of weak and sinful men. But that which appears is not the essential nature of the Church. Her nature is spiritual. The first Church consisted of fishermen and publicans, and its first increase was chiefly from the lower classes; 'Not many wise, not many mighty,' says the apostle (1 Cor. i. 26).<sup>(13)</sup> And yet how soon did this poor and despised band, with their foolishness of preaching, conquer the world! We have here a contradiction between means and end similar to what we saw in Jesus Christ, whose home was the despised town of Nazareth, yet whose inheritance was the whole world. But that which the eye can see is not the essence of the matter. We believe in Jesus Christ, *i.e.* we do not stop at the visible, but seize on the invisible; we mentally grasp His hidden nature, and behold therein what He truly is. We believe in one Holy Catholic Church, *i.e.*, we do not esteem that which our eyes behold, but that which she secretly is, to be her very nature.<sup>(14)</sup> Now, the essential ingredient of her nature, which makes the Church truly the Church, is the possession of the Holy Ghost. It was He who made the disciples certain and joyful in their faith; made them the one flock of Jesus Christ, the members of which are united by faith and love to their Head in heaven, and to each other on earth.

It has become one of the requirements of human nature to see in every man a brother. But the notion of brotherhood is not enough without the fact. This want has at all times produced associations extending

beyond the boundaries of civil and political communities. The Pythagorean circle of friendship, the societies gathered around the sacred mysteries in the old world, and the similar companies of various kinds which have been formed, all express that craving for association which draws men together. We may well see in them presentient anticipations of the all-embracing association of the Church. Is not Buddhism, with its great fundamental idea that we are to see and acknowledge in another, not a member of some particular rank, but a man as such—is not this, the only ancient religion of the East which made attempts to diffuse itself, a shadow, though a distorted one, of what the Church not only desires but effects.<sup>(15)</sup> And even the systems and forms of Socialism, which the present age has brought forth, even these ‘caricatures of what is holy,’ are a testimony to this want. The mere idea of human brotherhood is not enough, the fact is required. Men’s repeated attempts to institute it are predictions of its realisation. The Church is this fact. In her all men are equal, for she views all with respect to God. Here it is that all distinctions cease. Let the Church be banished from the world, and it would be again plunged into those national animosities which Christianity found in existence, but which she overcame by means of that great organisation of fraternity and equality which we call the Church.<sup>(16)</sup> The Church is the great institution of unanimity. As we travel about in the world, we meet with nothing but mere diversity. What is law in one place, has no

authority in another ; and what is here esteemed truth, is there rejected as error. Space separates minds, and opinions vary with distances. The zones of the earth are also walls of partition in the sphere of intellect, and with change of times comes change of ideas.<sup>(17)</sup> It is the Church which joins the differing minds of all zones and ages in one thought, and unites them all in one truth. Let her disappear from the earth, and that bond of mental union, which nothing else can replace, is destroyed. It is true that she also belongs to history, and is subject to change ; but underlying all change, is that secret unity of the One Spirit which fills all, of the one truth which all advocate, and which, after periods of declension and decay, ever renews its youth.<sup>(18)</sup> Herein consists her intrinsic unity, in the midst of every change of outward form. Wherever there are Christians, wherever there are members of the Church, they have a wide realm of thoughts and views in common, and meet each other in a world of similar feelings and emotions. Thus the Church is that bond of unanimity among mankind, which keeps the world together, as the soul does the members of the body.

If the fate of the world be contemplated merely from the point of view afforded by the interests of civilisation, it must be confessed that the Church, even by this organisation of unanimity among mankind, is an infinite blessing and an indispensable necessity to our race. ✓

But this office of the Church depends upon its *religious office*. This unanimity is the result of unity



of faith. If she ceased to effect this, she would no longer be able to bring about the former. Many as are the changes which the Church has experienced in the course of time, in the age of the apostles and the period of the catacombs, as well as in the days of her worldly power or in the period of Protestantism—her faith has ever remained essentially the same, and her worship ever similar. Her faith is belief in the Triune God. From the time of her foundation to our own days, all Christians, however they may be designated, however their opinions on other matters may differ, if called upon to confess their faith, would exclaim with one mouth and in one sense; ‘I believe in God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.’ All Christians glory in the grace of God; all acknowledge the Saviour Jesus Christ; all honour the Crucified. His name is the central point of the Church’s worship, His praise the soul of her devotion. Her hymns celebrate Him, her very stones speak of Him. Much as Christians and churches may dispute and quarrel with each other, this essential unity of faith still underlies all their contention; and there is one place where all Christians find themselves to be of one mind, and that is *the Cross*. Herein consists the unanimity of the Church.

The Church, however, is not merely that hidden community of souls—that aggregate of the children of God in all times and places—which we call the invisible church. The Church has also a special office in the world—the office of calling and gathering; and must, in order to fulfil it, come forth visibly and pro-

minently." 'Ye shall be my witnesses,' was the charge with which the Lord of the Church sent forth His disciples into the world to call the nations to Him, and to gather them into His flock. The Church is to be the herald of salvation, the messenger of truth, the instructor of the nations. The grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ and found its earthly home in the Church, is to be on her lips, to be the confession of her mouth, the preaching of her ministers, her means of leading the nations into the path of salvation. In proportion then as she understands and fulfils this office, is the Church on earth separated into the several Churches.

Allow me to speak to you of that great contrast in the Church, which we are accustomed to designate by the name of *Catholicism and Protestantism*.

That diversities should prevail in the Church, is not contrary to, but in conformity with, her nature. Unity, but not uniformity, is one of her essential characteristics. The preaching of the Gospel on the day of Pentecost in the various languages, by the apostles, signified that the Church was to become the Church of the nations, to speak to each nation in its own language, and to enter into its special temperament. The Church was to take one form among the people of the South, and another among the nations of the North; one form in the East, the world of constancy, another in the West, the leader of progress. But these are only diversities, not contrasts; this is only the multiplicity of unity, not separation. Separation

tion in the Church through diversity of faith and confession takes place, not on natural, but on moral grounds. It is the different measure of obedience to the Word of God which has called forth these contrasts.

The difference between North and South, between the German and Roman nations, is insufficient to explain the difference between the Romish and Protestant Churches. It might account for variations in the form and colour of Christianity, and in its ecclesiastical appearance, but not for diversities of faith. The South produced the unpictorial worship of the Reformed, as well as the pictorial worship of the Romish Church. And when Italy fell away from the Pope, he ever found faithful adherents in Germany. The difference between Romish and Protestant Christianity is of a deeper nature than can be accounted for by national diversity.

Wherein, then, does it consist?

The difference consists in opposite mental tendencies; and these, again, have their roots in opposite views of religion.

The opposite mental tendencies are sometimes designated as authority and liberty.<sup>(19)</sup> Catholicism represents authority; Protestantism represents liberty. The former advocates legitimacy; the latter, the rights of historical progress. The former, says Protestant controversy, is stagnation; the latter, says Romish controversy, is the spirit of revolution, though revolution has ever had her seat in Romish lands.

Rome represents authority, we represent the principle

of liberty and criticism; and history is fulfilling her ends by the co-operation of these two great powers of all historical movement. But authority makes its power felt among us also. The masses always follow authority; and how much do all of us accept upon authority! The greatest part of what is believed is believed because others have believed it. Certainly, we do demand the right of criticism; and it may be true that it is, as has been said, a Protestant spirit which is going through the world; the spirit of criticism having obtained the preponderance in the present time. But one cannot live upon criticism. It is truth which is the food of the mind; and the duty of criticism is to establish truth. But truth lays claim to authority. We do not, then, reject authority: we require only the authority of truth. The highest of all authority is due to Divine truth; and this it is which Protestantism confesses. Protestantism is not merely a method, but substance. Its substance is Divine truth; and this truth is the grace of God in Christ Jesus. Herein lies that distinction which we are seeking.

But Catholicism and Protestantism are not merely general mental tendencies. They are this; but beyond this they are religious powers, differing conceptions of Christianity,

What then, first, is the system of Catholicism? I will endeavour to represent it with all the objectivity I can. <sup>(20)</sup> Its train of thought is as follows:—

Man's supreme want is truth. I must have certainty about truth. In the strife of opinions I am:

prey to comfortless uncertainty as to what may be truth and what may be error, if truth cannot be made certain to me. How is it to be certain to me? One says one thing; another, another. Where shall I get information that I may rely on? The Church is the possessor of truth. I must hear the Church; she must know what is truth. When Christ was pleased to bring truth into the world, He was at the same time pleased to found a Church to possess and impart the truth, and to guarantee it to individuals. If, then, she is to guarantee the truth to me, she must be so constituted as to be able to do this. If I am to ask and to hear the Church, I must be able to ask and to hear her. I must know where the Church is; I must find her; I must see and hear her; I must be able to learn with unequivocal certainty what her answer is. Hence the Church cannot be something invisible, which can neither be laid hold of nor comprehended; it must be a visible and tangible institution, which can speak to me, which I can hear; it must have its accredited organs, to whom I can apply, and who can speak to me; it must be an organism having members; it must be a hierarchy; it must have a judicial tribunal, to decide on doubtful or contested points; it must have a supreme head, a voice whose utterance is decisive. Now, if I am to be certain that what the Church says is truth, it must be infallible, must have within it the Spirit of Truth; must be enlightened by Him, inspired by Him. The Holy Ghost is infallible. He also makes the Church infallible. If it were not



so, I should be ever wandering upon a sea of comfortless uncertainty. The Church is not inspired and infallible in all her members. She must be so only in her organs, in her supreme tribunal. The mouth of the Church must speak truth. What the Church says through her supreme representation, the Holy Ghost says. If, then, I want to know what is truth, I only need to know what the Church authorises. If an ecclesiastical council is legitimately convoked, has legitimately come to its decisions ; if its decisions are confirmed by the supreme head, the Pope ; if the Pope has decided with Papal plenipotence,—the decision is truth, and is spoken by the Holy Spirit. No subjective criticism avails here, but obedience alone. A Christian's first duty is obedience to the Church ; his greatest sin, disobedience to the Church's authority. The root of all sin, and the chief sin, is to want to know anything better than the Church does. The individual has no rights apart from the Church—no right of private judgment, of private conscience. There is no Christian independence apart from the Church—no independent conviction of truth, no independent assurance of a state of grace, no independent appeal to Scripture ; but every Christian, as regards his faith, his spiritual life, his assurance, and his understanding of Scripture, is ever dependent upon the Church—the Church of the Bishop of Rome.

Such is the system of Catholicism ; and we cannot but confess that it is both logical and consistent.



Many have been caught by the snare of its logic ; and as for the reality of this system itself,—the Church of Rome,—who can deny that it is the most magnificent edifice which the human mind has ever erected ? Its superstructure, based upon the broadest foundations, rises, by the gradations of episcopacy, up to its supreme head, the Bishop of Rome, the servant of the servants of God, the vicegerent of Jesus Christ, the vice-God, the sub-God, as he has been called. <sup>(21)</sup>

Rome has from of old been accustomed to govern the nations (*Tu regere imperio populos Romane memento*). <sup>(22)</sup> It is true that only the ruins of her Forum and imperial palaces now speak to us of her ancient greatness, but her universal sway has revived under a Christian garb. The Romish Church has taken the place of the Roman empire ; she has inherited from old Rome both her administrative talent and imperial destiny, and has added spiritual to secular means of sovereignty. The circle of her sway embraces not only the nations ; she governs also the relations of life, and the consciences of mankind.

She has undergone many transformations and experienced many changes, but her pretensions have ever been the same. Formerly, the Bishop of Rome asserted that he bore in his hands two swords, the secular as well as the spiritual, and that the empire and all secular dominion was only held in fief of himself. <sup>(23)</sup> It is true that he no longer appoints and deposes princes, that the treaty of Westphalia,

and the new order of states endure, despite his protests, and that even his excommunication seems to have lost its effect ; but his pretensions are still the same that they were of old ; for not a stone may be taken out of the firmly compacted edifice, and his spiritual authority has for a long time suffered no diminution. There was a time when it seemed undecided who was to have the supreme power—the Pope, or a general council ; and the great councils of the Middle Ages claimed the most extensive powers. <sup>(24)</sup> But consistency of principle has resulted in the ascription of supreme authority to the Pope ; and he has already begun to lay down new dogmas without the assent of a council. <sup>(25)</sup> The Pope, as the sole depository of supreme ecclesiastical power, is the top-stone of the whole system. It was reserved for Pius IX. to add this top-stone to the structure. The new dogma of Papal Infallibility is but the final and legitimate result of the principle. <sup>(26)</sup>

We admit the logic and consistency of this system, but as for truth, we deny that it possesses it.

It is not my business here to enter into controversial matters ; but merely to bring before you the characteristics of the system. I therefore content myself with giving, in few words, our reasons for rejecting these assumptions. The Romish system is condemned by a threefold contradiction. It is contradicted by fact, by history, and by the very nature of the matter in question.

When the Romish Church says that she is the sole

Church, we oppose to this statement the fact that, beyond the limits of her sway, the Holy Ghost carries on His work, and Christians have a locality; and that, hence, the Church of Jesus Christ is not confined within her boundaries.

When the Romish Church asserts that she is inspired in her organs, especially in her supreme organ, the bishop of Rome, and that what he says and assumes is infallible, we oppose to this the fact that councils and popes have erred, from the days of the heretical pope Liberius, who condemned Athanasius "the soul of orthodoxy," and from Honorius who was found guilty of heresy by an acknowledged œcumenical council, and by his own successors in the papal see, <sup>(27)</sup> down to the times of the great schism, when one pope excommunicated another pope and his adherents until the whole of Western Christendom was excommunicated, and the emperor and council had to take the matter in hand, and down to Pius IX. and his dogma of the Immaculate Conception, a dogma opposed not only by Scripture but also by tradition. <sup>(28)</sup>

And, finally, when the Romish Church says that the first thing is to be certain of the place where truth is to be sought and found, that we may thus be certain of the truth itself, we answer, that God would not have made the knowledge and certainty of the truth so slight a matter, that nothing more should be needful than to apply to the right address and to get supplied with the article. Certainty about truth is not a question of law, but a question of conscience; it is

not outwardly but inwardly that I must have assurance of it. Truth is not proved by its place, but by itself. I do not believe in Christ because I believe in the Church, but I believe in the Church because I believe in Christ. Certainty about truth is a work of the Holy Ghost, which is not carried on in the way of a juristic logic, but by His answers to the inquiries of the conscience concerning the soul's salvation.

It was from such inquiries that the Reformation arose ; it is in such inquiries that *Protestantism* is rooted. It was the felt need of salvation, the inquiry after assurance of salvation, which was the soul of Luther's life and work, the power of his influence upon minds, the strength of early Protestantism, and which will ever be the secret of its power. They who would have a Protestantism founded on aught else, annihilate its truth and destroy its future.

The word Protestantism has at all times been much misused. <sup>(29)</sup> Protestantism is not a mere negation. Truly it is a negation—the negation of falsehood setting itself up for Divine truth—the negation of human authority usurping the place of Divine ; yet this negation rests upon an affirmation which is its premise, viz., the supreme authority of the Word of God and His truth, in matters of faith and salvation. Protestantism is not merely a constant struggle, search, and inquiry. It is true that it arose from inquiry, and that inquiry and research belong to its nature. For truth is infinite, and no one possesses it who is not constantly acquiring it. Truth is not dead capital which a

man may lay up in a napkin, but a living possession and a living blessing. Protestantism, moreover, is not merely a search after truth, but its possession. It is not merely an inquiry after salvation; it is also the answer to this inquiry. For it is not merely a school, but a church; not merely a society of investigators or doubters, but of believers. And the answer to that great inquiry of the conscience concerning the soul's salvation, from which Protestantism and the Protestant Church were born, is that saying of the apostle: 'Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved' (Acts xvi. 31). It was the experience of Luther, that neither works of penitence, nor obedience to the Church, nor anything else, but only faith in Christ Jesus, who has atoned for and expiated our guilt, and reconciled us to God, can take away sin and give peace to the conscience and assurance of salvation to the soul. It is faith in Christ Jesus as our Saviour and Reconciler, and assurance of the mercy of God and the forgiveness of sins, even our own sins, which alone make Christians really such. This faith is not a mere fiction of the mind, but an act of the will; it is not a mere effort of the understanding, but a communion of the heart with Jesus Christ.

And it is this which, according to Protestant teaching, constitutes the nature of the Church. The Church is not merely an external institution. As it appears to us, indeed, it is an external institution, with appointed ordinances and customs, and an external government. But these do not constitute the Church's

essence, they only belong to her earthly manifestation. All these do but subserve her proper nature. According to her inward and spiritual nature she is the people of God upon earth, the communion of believers, the assembly of all God's children below. <sup>(30)</sup> Wherever there are believers, let them be called by what names they may, there is the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. And though our eyes may see little or nothing of them, yet by faith we know that in all places Jesus Christ has a people who are spiritually united to Him by faith and love, and who form one great union of souls with each other. This vast, wide, ample communion of all believers is no pleasant dream, but a reality, the highest reality. For while all else is subject to death, and will fade and pass away, this invisible community, this hidden Church, will abide for ever. It forms the germ of all the several visible churches. Through it the several churches are truly the Church. But it assumes a different appearance in different churches, an appearance brighter or more obscure in proportion as the signs and forms by which the invisible Church becomes visible and comprehensible, viz., the preaching of the Word and the Sacraments, are preserved and administered in more or less purity, *i.e.*, in more or less conformity to Holy Scripture, as the sole rule and model of the Church's doctrine and practice.

For this is the visible side which does belong to the nature of the Church. The Church is by her own nature not merely invisible, she has also a visibility



which is essential to her. Romanists reproach us with teaching, only an invisible Church, which is everywhere and nowhere. But this is a misconception, whether entertained by Romanists, or here and there by some among ourselves. According to evangelical doctrine, the Church is indeed, first of all, 'the fellowship of faith and of the Holy Ghost in the heart,' as our confession expresses it. But faith requires outward means by which it is produced and maintained, and the Holy Spirit carries on His work in the heart only by such means, hence called means of grace. As all human intercourse of mind with mind, and all influence of one human spirit upon another must be brought about by external means, and chiefly by words, in which mind attains its suitable and sensible form, so also does the operation of the Holy Spirit require—so long as we are in the flesh—external and sensible organs and means by which to approach our souls.

These means, by which the Holy Spirit works, are the Word and Sacraments. Hence, it is just because the Church is a work of the Holy Ghost upon earth, that these belong to her proper nature. The nature of the Church cannot be fully described unless these 'means of grace,' the word and sacrament by which the Church becomes external and visible, are included in the description. Eternal grace has deposited its heavenly treasure in these earthen and sensible vessels, and so filled them therewith that they everywhere and always convey and dispense it. They are, however, given to the Church, not that she may quietly possess,

but that she may use and administer them. For this purpose the Church must have a ministry, commissioned by herself to administer them—the ministry of the means of grace. As far as the word is preached, as far as Baptism is administered, and the Lord's Supper participated, so far does the action of the Church of Christ extend; and in such action, and in the means of such action, the Church herself—born as she is of the Spirit of Jesus Christ—appears an object of the senses external, visible, and comprehensible. To this Church, this dispenser of the means of grace, let us cleave, and not rest satisfied with the inward and spiritual union in which we individually stand with our Lord and Saviour. For we are called to association and not to isolation, and even our personal Christianity is dependent upon that Christian association which we call the Church, and those means of grace which the Church dispenses. Only in fellowship with the Church can our religious life maintain its health and vigour.

Hence the Church has by its very nature two aspects, an invisible and a visible, an internal and an external. It is an association of believers, and it is an institution for the dispensation of the means of grace. With this second aspect is combined that external order of government, worship, and customs postulated by the Church's earthly existence, and determined by her historical relations. This external order is also necessary to the Church. No Church on earth can exist without prescribing to itself some definite, though it may be more or less elaborated order. This,

however, is not necessary in the same sense that it is necessary to the Church to be the society of believers, and the institution of the means of grace. For the latter is necessary to her heavenly, the former, only to her earthly office. Faith and the means of grace are necessary to salvation; external order and constitution are only necessary because everything on earth must be ordered and every society managed in some way. This then belongs not to the Church's nature, but only to her existence as a fact in the world. Hence this actual earthly existence of the Church has no share in the eternal constancy which belongs to the Church's proper nature, but, having only a historical and temporal origin, is subject to the laws of time and history. It is in the intrinsic nature of the Church that the eternal kingdom of God has its home; the temporal form of the Church on the contrary is but the external covering in which the treasure of the kingdom of God is deposited. We can find and comprehend the Church herself only in this her protective covering. Nevertheless, it is the Church herself and not her covering which we ought to grasp, and which we are concerned to find. It may well be that the Church is existing in a poor and destitute condition, but she is a queen upon earth, even though clothed in the garments of a beggar.

In this sense then must we distinguish between church and church, between the church according to her proper nature and the church according to her external earthly form; between the church in so far

as she is the company of believers and the institution of the means of grace, and the church so far as she is, like the state, a legally ordered, external corporation, between the church in a religious, and the church in a juridical sense. We must also constantly bear in mind, that here on earth these two aspects do not fully correspond, but that a certain amount of contradiction ever exists between them. For the nature of the church never attains a perfectly adequate expression in her earthly form, which is always subject to weakness and imperfection. Hence there is no lack of occasion for taking offence at the church. They who look no farther than to the external appearance presented by the church, will perceive abundance of faults, weaknesses and deficiencies, which may make them misconceive her, and even alienate them from her. They only who concern themselves about the church herself, will be capable of disregarding all the offences and contradictions presented by the external appearance of the church, and of feeling a happy certainty of her heavenly nature. And blessed are they who are not offended at her.

We may well say : it is with the church as with her Lord Himself. What faith saw and found in Him was the Son of God and the revelation of eternal life. This heavenly mystery was disclosed to men and imparted to them by the word of His mouth, which proclaimed grace and truth and sank into the heart ; also in the miracles in which His word attained a sensible form, and in which the blessing of that word

was variously manifested and appropriated to individuals. But all this was deposited in the Son of Man who bore the form of a servant, and was subject to the wants and weaknesses of human nature as we ourselves are. They who looked only at what was evident to the eye might well be offended in Him. For in His outward appearance but little of the Eternal Son of God and of the manifestation of that life which proceedeth from God was to be seen. On the contrary, all that struck the senses was rather opposed, than agreeable to such a claim. If the contradictions and hindrances placed in the way by His external appearance were to be surmounted, it was necessary that the effects of His hidden nature should be felt, and that faith in Himself should be kindled in the heart by His word. And so too is it with the church. The church is the place of communion with God, the kingdom of grace, and the institution of salvation through the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments. But all this is deposited in the earthen vessel which bears the form of a servant. It was not till Jesus was glorified, and His human body also received into the heavenly glory, that the contradiction which had till then existed between His intrinsic nature and His outward condition was dissolved, or reconciled. And so too does the church await a future in which she will exchange that form of a servant which she now wears, for a glory corresponding to her inner nature. Not till then will she appear as what she really is.



Now the Romish church already sees the kingdom of God in the church as at present existing, and in her external reality. In her eyes the visible church on earth, her external order and government are no mere temporal and historical necessity of only transitory importance, and subject, like all that is historical, to change. On the contrary, she regards these as so essential to the manifestation of the church, that she can conceive of the church in no other form than that which she has actually attained and now bears, in the Romish communion. Hence church government is with her a matter of dogma, *i.e.*, an article of essential doctrine, and therefore an object of faith. The external organism of the church is in her eyes the church itself, and therefore so filled and inspired by the Holy Ghost as to be exempt from all error, and endowed with infallibility, whatever may be the personal relation of the representatives and heads of the hierarchical organism to the Holy Spirit and to Christ. The church is not first of all, as with us, the congregation of believers united by faith, and the Holy Ghost to Christ their head, and in heart, to one another. On the contrary, the church is, in the first place, an external institution, and an external commonwealth, as visible and palpable as any national commonwealth. That which we can, and must only BELIEVE, is thought to be already here in visible reality. The earthly and visible is, without farther change, the manifestation of the heavenly and future. The view held concerning the church is always



related to that held concerning the person of Jesus Christ. For the church is the image of Jesus Christ. Now there has ever been a touch of Docetism, *i.e.* a tendency to merge the human and natural in the supernatural, in the view entertained by the Church of Rome concerning the person of Christ. This is the peculiarity of the apocryphal, as distinguished from the canonical gospels. They make the child Jesus already perform miracles, and miracles of the strangest kind. They know of no development, but only of the appearance of the heavenly through the transparent and vanishing cover of the natural. Now, the Romish notion of the Church corresponds to this. The supernatural reality of the Church is everywhere perfectly manifested and fully expressed in the earthly form. The latter is but the transparent covering of the heavenly. The invisible is absolutely visible, and the future already present, so that it may be said, the Romish Church is the Church erroneously regarded as fully manifested in this world.

In contrast thereto the *Reformed Church* is the Church, as one-sidedly relegated to the next world. If by the former the Church is regarded as essentially the visible Church, the latter views it as essentially the invisible Church. The visible is not the appearance of the invisible, nor the means by which we are to participate therein, but only a sign directing us to something beyond itself in the sphere of the invisible. The Reformed Church connects the salvation of the individual with the will of God in the other world.

The threads of individual fate are directly connected with the absolute will of God. God has no need of any earthly intervention, nor is the earthly capable of becoming the means, properly so-called, of the Divine operation. For God and the world, Creator and creature, the Infinite and the finite, stand in too great contrast to each other, to allow the earthly really to include the heavenly, and to become its depositary. Even in the person of Jesus Christ the Divine far overtowered the limits of the human, and was not restricted to the latter. And thus is it also in Church transactions. The Church, properly so-called, is the absolutely invisible Church; the visible Church is not the reality of the Church. She is, and in truth continues, the Church of the world to come, not finding in the Church of this world even her present form, but merely a sign of her future reality, as we hope to see it. This is the case also with Church transactions. In the means of grace, in the sacraments, the earthly and visible is not the bearer and medium of the heavenly gift and operation of grace, but only a sign and pledge thereof. As for grace itself, its gift and operation, we obtain this only when by faith we soar above all that is earthly and visible, and grasp the grace of God in the sphere of the invisible. To this inward elevation of the spirit, the earthly sign can be only a help and incentive, nor is it designed to be anything more. The gift of God itself continues to be the gift of the world beyond.

The *Lutheran* Church teaches the union of this

present world-with the other world. It is the Church of the intercourse of both worlds. In its view of Jesus Christ, the human and natural is neither swallowed up in the Divine, nor even overtowered, and therefore really forsaken, but pervaded and filled thereby: the one is in the other, where the one is, there is the other also, and the earthly is the bearer of the heavenly. Such is the doctrine of St John's Gospel: 'The word became flesh.' In the flesh of Jesus Christ, the eternal life was locked up; in the man Jesus was the Presence of God—the life was manifested (1 John i. 2). With this corresponds the notion of the Church. She is neither merely of this world, nor merely of the next world; neither only visible, nor only invisible, but both visible and invisible. For her invisible and spirit-born nature has a visibility in this world, in the Word and sacraments: these are the outward appearance of the true Church. In them, in these means of grace, are the spiritual treasures of the Church deposited—here are they audibly, palpably present. So, too, is it with the life of Christians. We are already what we are becoming, and still we are as yet only becoming what we really are. We are becoming it, moreover, because the new and heavenly life of the Spirit is filling and pervading the natural life with its presence. For we must neither absolutely deny to the sphere of natural life its due claims, nor must the spiritual life advance in paths of its own wholly outside of the earthly; but both must be combined into a unity. The whole sphere of the natural, together with all the

productions of the intellectual life, has its due independence, and is not, as Rome teaches, held in fief of the Church, for it is a work of God the Creator. Its office, however, is to be the bearer of revelation, and the medium of the saving work of the Redeemer. He inlays those natural gifts which the Father provides with His gift of grace, and we are to inlay our natural life with that new life which the Son has given us. The former takes place in the sacraments, the latter in the sacrifice of our life. This is the way to future glory. Then will the heavenly and earthly, the spiritual and the sensible, have fully permeated each other. And the path towards this goal is laid down by the gift of the Lord and the duties of life. <sup>(31)</sup>

It is not in individual doctrines merely that the Churches differ, but in the different impression each has received from a totally different instinct. As long as this difference exists, all external union is in vain, and only an occasion of strife and discord. Great and universal facts of history, like the separation of the Church, do not rest on mere misunderstandings, and cannot be done away with by mere good resolutions. Truly this is pain and grief to us. But the pain and grief must be borne with patience, and the union which we hope for sought by prayer. Even this separation must subserve the purposes of God. For, much as our hearts may be grieved by the fact that the one Church of Jesus Christ is rent into separate Churches, we yet know that each Church has its special gift wherewith to labour in the work of extending the

kingdom of God, and that each is to minister to the other with the gift it has received. And wherever we meet a Christian, whether beneath the sway of Rome, or among the disciples of Calvin, there we know that we greet a child of God, a brother in Christ, and an heir of salvation. Let us rejoice in that unity of faith and spirit which exists in spite of all differences, until it shall please the Lord to bring us to perfect communion of mind and harmony of thought. Till then, we must walk in the path which God sets before us, following that light which illumines it. This light to our path is Holy Scripture, to which my next lecture will call your attention.

## LECTURE VIII.

### HOLY SCRIPTURE.



THE Christian Church has never been without *Holy Scripture*. Before the New Testament was written and collected, she possessed the *Old Testament*, and revered it as the Word of God.

Our Lord himself often appealed to it.<sup>(1)</sup> He quoted passages from almost every book of the Old Testament. He used the Old Testament Scriptures as a weapon against temptation, as a means of instruction for the people and His disciples. He used them, moreover, to express His own inmost feelings in the very moments when His heart was most deeply moved. It is evident that Scripture was the atmosphere in which He lived and moved, the sanctuary in which His soul ever dwelt.

His disciples, too, took up the same position with respect to the Old Testament Scriptures as their Master had done. They had known them from their youth; for Jewish boys were early instructed in the Scriptures. 'From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures,' writes St Paul to Timothy (2 Tim. iii. 15). For he had a Jewish mother, who had early initiated him in the



sacred writings. And the Jewish historian Josephus tells us of the high respect in which Scripture was held by the Jews. Every one, he assures us, would be ready to lay down his life for the Scriptures; for to revere them as the Holy Word of God seemed, as it were, innate.<sup>(2)</sup> To the disciples of Christ they had, besides, a special importance, as the prophetic testimony to Jesus Christ. 'They are they which testify of Me,' had they heard their Master say (John v. 39); and such had they themselves found them to be. The risen Saviour, we are told (Luke xxiv. 27-45), expounded to them the Scripture, to show them that, from first to last, He was its aim and object. Thus the Old Testament, supported by the authority of Christ and His apostles, was transferred to the Christian Church.

To this, in the course of time, was added the *New Testament*. Jesus left no writings; for He was sent to proclaim grace and truth by the word of His mouth, and to redeem us by His death and resurrection. He was not to be the author but the subject of Holy Scripture. It was to treat of Him, not to be written by Him. His apostles, too, were sent by their Lord, not in the first place to write, but to preach the Gospel: 'Go and teach all nations' (Matt. xxviii. 19); 'Preach the Gospel to every creature' (Mark xvi. 15). The Word is the chief matter in Christianity; and the first form of the Word is oral teaching. It is by this that soul speaks directly to soul, mind to mind.

The written Word is an expedient to supply the lack of it, but a necessary one.

How did the composition of the New Testament Scriptures take place?

Christian instruction began with the narration of the Gospel history. But it is the nature of history to be recorded. Such records of that Sacred History soon arose, and, among them, our four Gospels were distinguished as the most genuine. When St Matthew, as we are informed, after having for many years preached the Gospel in Palestine, was about to visit other countries, he desired to leave in the hands of the Christians dwelling in Judea, a written compendium of his evangelical preaching, that they might be able to defend themselves against Jewish attacks. The Gospel preaching of St Peter in heathen lands was collected by his companion St Mark; and in order that Christians among the heathen, who desired more exact information, might no longer be forced to content themselves with fragmentary and less trustworthy records, Luke wrote his great historical work—the Gospel, and Acts of the Apostles. St John, moreover, before the close of his life, was prevailed upon by the elders of the Church of Ephesus to commit to writing, in the Gospel which bears his name and concludes the series, those reminiscences of the life of Jesus Christ which he had frequently delivered to his Ephesian flock. Such was the origin of the four Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles. <sup>(3)</sup>

The Epistles were occasioned by the special diffi-

culties, dangers, or necessities of the churches or individuals to whom they were addressed. When any church received an apostolic epistle, it was not regarded as private property, but communicated to the neighbouring churches. The close of the Epistle to the Colossians (chap. iv. 16), shows how St Paul himself provided for such mutual communication of his Epistles. Hence, copies of the several Epistles arose, and a collection was gradually formed. It was a matter of rejoicing to possess such a compensation for the preaching of their absent teachers, and the Epistles were frequently read for the edification of the assembled Church. The last sacred writing, the Revelation of St John, was written for the instruction and consolation of the Church during that period of sore trial which was approaching, and during which there would be no apostle to exhort and comfort her.

Thus the New Testament Scriptures were designed both to support, and to compensate for the want of the oral teaching of the apostles, and to invest it, as it were, with an abiding presence and influence in the Christian Church.

The separate sacred writings were early collected and combined into a whole. A collection of our Gospels had already taken place at the close of the first and beginning of the second century.<sup>(4)</sup> From the conclusion of the Second Epistle of St Peter (2 Pet. iii. 16), it is evident that there was, when it was written, already a collection—even if an incomplete one—of the Pauline Epistles; and, according to

indisputable testimony, the New Testament itself, as we now have it, existed with the exception of a few books concerning whose canonicity universal conviction has not yet been attained, towards the end of the second century, in both the Eastern and Western Churches. (<sup>5</sup>) Christians were persuaded that in these writings the Holy Ghost had spoken with as much purity and power as in the Old Testament Scriptures. Thus this New Testament collection was added to the Old, which had been received by means of Israel, and the whole regarded as the one Holy Bible, the one Word of God.

It is true that at that period oral tradition was still ample and clear. Certain disciples of the apostles, or at least disciples of the former, were still living. In the Churches founded or instructed by the apostles, the remembrance of these great teachers was still vivid. If any one, then, desired to become acquainted with the Christian faith, he had but to resort to the localities and holders of primitive tradition. The greatest teachers of the West, a Tertullian and an Irenæus, could, in opposing the heretical teachers who distorted the Word of God according to their own fancies, appeal to this genuine tradition, and thus put an end to all further dissension concerning the true meaning of Scripture. But, together with this primitive tradition of the then proximate times of the apostles, there co-existed the apostolic teaching deposited in writings, which, while they bore incontestable testimony to their doctrine, were also regarded as of Divine authority,

and as the work of the Holy Spirit. A series of testimony to the high regard in which the New Testament Scriptures were held, has descended to us from the earliest times, clearly proving that, even in those days in which the stream of tradition was still pure and abundant, authority to decide was attributed to them.<sup>(6)</sup>

This regard continued, in theory at least, till modern times. Never has it yet been denied in the Christian Church, that the decision in all questions of faith belongs to Holy Scripture. <sup>(7)</sup> In practice, however, it has been otherwise, in proportion as tradition (so-called) has been increasingly respected and diffused. Under this name were soon included, not merely, as at first, such acts and words as were supposed to have descended from Christ and His apostles, though orally transmitted instead of recorded in writing—but also the whole circle of dogmas and practices which had been instituted by Church councils, and recognised by the Church. As the Church itself—this visible presence of Christ, as it was esteemed—became the supreme authority to Christians, its word and commands were regarded as ultimately decisive in all questions. Hence it came to pass, that while in theory the decision was declared to rest with the Scriptures, in practice it was in the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities, <sup>(8)</sup> until it was shown, at the time of the Reformation, that the corrupt stream of supposed tradition had no innate power of purifying

itself from those disturbing elements which either injured or corrupted the saving power of the word.

It was this experience which, at *the era of the Reformation*, led to the conviction that the remedy for all the corruptions of ecclesiastical tradition lay only in the judicial authority of Holy Scripture. With a clearness and decision never before known, *Holy Scripture* was declared by the Reformation, and is declared by the Protestant Church, to be *the sole umpire* in matters of Christian faith and practice. Thus Scripture has obtained among us an importance radically differing from that which it possesses in the Church of Rome. Hence, our own Church, too, lays special stress upon the study of Holy Scripture, and regards it as the foundation of all theology. Never and nowhere has so much self-sacrificing diligence been devoted to the investigation of Scripture as since the Reformation, and in the Protestant Church, for this importance of Scripture forms part of the very nature of our Church. If the Romanists say: The ultimate decision rests with the Church, for she is the infallible vehicle of the Holy Spirit; we Protestants say: The ultimate decision rests with Holy Scripture, for it is the authentic testimony of Jesus Christ. The whole essence of Protestantism, and the whole creed of the Protestant Church, may be summed up in these twofold sayings: None but Christ! and nothing but Scripture! Is it asked: Where is salvation to be found, and wherein does it consist? Our answer is: In none but Christ; He alone is the propitiation for



our sins ; and faith in Him alone makes us righteous before God. And is it asked : Where have we certain testimony to Jesus Christ, and an ultimate decision in questions of salvation and of the way of salvation ? Our answer is : In Scripture alone, for it is the rule of faith and practice for the Church of Jesus Christ and for all Christians. These are the two chief truths and principles of Protestantism. (<sup>9</sup>)

But the question of Christ, and the question of Holy Scripture, are the two leading questions of the day, the two most contested articles of Christian doctrine. Is Christ the Son of God ? Are the Scriptures the Word of God ? Is not Christ a mere man, though an extraordinary man ? Is not Scripture a merely human, though an important human work ? Amidst the various arguments and counter-arguments, it has come to this, that many know not what else to say of Christ than : ‘ We know not who he was ; ’ nor of Scripture than : ‘ We know not what to think of it. ’ Others, again, have done with Christ and with Scripture altogether, and rejected both the one and the other. They who do not believe in Christ do not believe in the Scriptures which testify of Him. The two stand or fall together. It is important however that these questions should be decided. For as the history of mankind is determined by Christ, so is our whole religious and intellectual life determined by Scripture.

Having, then, made this brief historical survey, let us proceed to consider *the importance* of Holy Scripture to the Church and to the individual Christian.

Scripture is of supreme importance to our *whole intellectual and spiritual life*.

The whole range of Christian culture and mental wealth springs from two roots which are found in the past : one in the lands of Rome and Greece, the other in the land of God's people. From the one we derive our intellectual culture, from the other our religion. And it is our religion which, together with the secular cultivation of Greece and Rome, and the national spirit of our people, forms that one great whole which we call Christian civilisation. The instrument, however, of all intellectual cultivation is literature. As the spirit of those great nations of civilisation speaks to us through the writings of their authors, by means of which, too, such works of art as have been transmitted to us become intelligible, and speak in a language which we can comprehend, so has the religion of Israel and of Christendom its literature. In it does the religious spirit of that home of religion speak to us. Side by side with the literature of secular culture, we possess this sacred literature of religion. Nor need this sacred literature shrink from ranking itself by the side of the secular literature of civilisation. Even apart from its religious importance, and regarded only from a human point of view, the Bible is the most magnificent literary work existing in the whole world—as great through the touching simplicity and historical importance of its narratives, as it is through the fulness and depth of its thoughts, the power and variety of its discourses, and

the abundance and beauty of its poetry. Long ere Pindar celebrated in his odes the Olympic victors, had David composed those psalms whose soaring thoughts and powerful words still refresh our souls. And long before Homer charmed the enraptured ears of the youthful nations on the coasts of Asia Minor by the deeds of the heroes of Troy, had Moses and his sister sung their songs of victory on the overthrow of the Egyptian monarch, and Deborah celebrated in her bold metaphors the victory of Israel. When the foundations of Rome, the world's future metropolis, were being laid upon the hills by the Tiber, the prophets of Israel were surveying, with a glance enlightened by the Spirit, the fate of the nations, and predicting their future destiny; while, with a power of eloquence surpassing that of Demosthenes, and with flights of poetry more lofty than those of Æschylus, they announced the judgments of God upon the sins of their nation, and in tones sweeter than the sweet numbers of a Sophocles, spoke of His grace. There is no single note in the whole scale of human emotion, from the thunders of holy indignation or the heart-rending cry of despair, to the softest accents of mercy or the ardent lays of love, which does not find expression in Scripture. We keep in memory the names and sayings of the seven wise men of Greece; but what is their wisdom to the treasures of practical wisdom laid up in the Proverbs of the Old Testament? We dive into the depths of Plato's views, and admire the nobleness of his ideas; but the Scriptures speak of the world of the eternal

ideal, as of the well known home of their spirit, and express the deepest thoughts and most comprehensive views with as much certainty and simplicity as though they were treating of the simplest truths in the world, or of those self-evident principles which all acknowledge. Truly, when viewed only from a human point of view, as a mere work of the human mind, Scripture far surpasses all the literary productions of all nations and ages. Let us but imagine that we had never possessed the Bible, and that it had but just now been for the first time discovered in the corner, perhaps, of some library—and what an impression would such a discovery make ! It would create the greatest sensation which a literary discovery could create ; a far greater one than if Homer's lays, Shakespeare's plays, or Goethe's poems should for the first time suddenly appear. The wonderful book would form the topic of conversation in all society, professorships would be founded for its interpretation, and to know and read it would form a part of every education. For it contains within itself a whole world of thoughts ; it is a universe of mind. Reville, an advocate of modern French rationalism, concludes an essay in the *Revue des deux Mondes* (1864) with the following words : ' One day the question was started in an assembly, What book a man condemned to a life-long imprisonment, to whom but one would be allowed, had better choose to take into his cell with him ? The company consisted of Catholics, Protestants, philosophers, and even materialists ; but all agreed that his choice could fall only on

the Bible ' (10) a distinguished tribute to the Bible—a tribute not merely to its intellectual excellence, but also to its *religious* importance.~

In speaking of other writings, we are wont to expatiate upon the enjoyment they have afforded us, or the admiration they have called forth, when we would convey a notion of the impression they have made upon us. From the Scriptures, however, another atmosphere is exhaled. They do indeed elicit our admiration, and afford us a high degree of intellectual enjoyment; but if we are to declare the peculiar effect they produce upon us, we must say: It is the spirit of religion which moves us, and which we here meet with in a power and purity found nowhere besides. Here is the original source whence flows the religious spirit. Hither, therefore, does the religious life ever return as to its source. What else was the Reformation than a return to the sources of religious life? As at the Reformation era there was a return to the original sources of intellectual culture, so was there also to the original sources of religion. The former were sought in the literature of Greece and Rome, the latter in Holy Scripture. The former movement was the idea of the Humanists, with their classical studies, the latter of the Scripture principle of the Reformation. In certain individuals, as in Melancthon and others, both were united; and the union became an indissoluble one in the Protestant Church, for the languages and the Gospel are intimately united. God himself hath joined them together; for it was He



who caused the Old Testament to be written in Hebrew, the New in Greek. 'The languages,' says Luther, 'are the scabbard in which the sword of the Spirit is hidden.' <sup>(11)</sup> But the spirit which speaks to us from the Holy Scriptures in these languages is not the human spirit, but the spirit of religion itself. It is in the Scriptures that we hear the original utterances of religion. A return to Scripture is for every age the revival of its religious life. When, in the first decade of the present century, the religious spirit, reviving from the mutilation and shallowness of rationalism, stirred the depths of men's inner life, it was the return to Scripture which gave strength, health, and a future, to this revival of religion. Then, as at the Reformation era, it was the Epistle to the Romans more especially which seized upon and ruled the thoughts and feelings of men. And how frequently has it happened that when, at particular seasons and places, the study of Scripture has been diligently cultivated, a revival of religious life and evangelical Christianity has been the result. <sup>(12)</sup> Scripture is the primitive source of religion, and herein lies its *necessity*.

How far, then, may Scripture be said to be necessary? Certainly it cannot be said that Scripture is absolutely necessary to the salvation of the individual Christian. <sup>(13)</sup> What is necessary to him is the matter of Scripture. Many have been saved who never read the Bible, who, perhaps, never knew it. Irenæus tells us of Christian congregations on the banks of the Rhine, towards the end of the second century, who,



though not possessing the Word of God in the Scriptures, nevertheless bore it in their hearts. There is assuredly but one thing necessary to salvation: to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. We can, then, conceive an individual Christian just able to exist without Scripture. But if in matters of faith, he would really be certain and independent, he cannot dispense with it. As in common life a man who cannot read is ever, to a certain degree, dependent upon others, so is it also in religious life. It is indispensable to the independence and maturity of religious faith and life, to be able to ascertain for oneself, as it is said of the Bereans (Acts xvii. 11), whether these things are so. Although the Christian is referred, in the first instance, to the preaching and instruction of the Church, yet he is not to believe merely upon the Church's word, but to search and convince himself. For this purpose he needs the Scriptures; for all religious teaching must be tested by this primitive source of religious truth. In this sense, then, Scripture is indispensable even to the individual Christian. To the Church, however, and its office of teaching, it is of the first and most absolute necessity. For the Church must have a rule for her guidance in faith and practice, and for the resolution of those doubts and questions which may arise during the course of her history.

But what is this rule and standard to be? What else but that revelation of God by which He has made known to the world His purposes of love? It is this which is the foundation of religion and of the Church,

It is this which should be the Church's rule of judgment, and it is this which is deposited in Holy Scripture. For what is the *matter* of the Bible, but those acts and words of God in which He has opened His very heart, and disclosed to us His purposes of salvation—that whole, great, glorious history in which His thoughts of love have been revealed and fulfilled? The Bible is no mere collection of maxims, and precepts, or religious truths, but that great history of salvation which, commencing with the first beginning of our race, was continued through the times of the patriarchs and prophets, culminated in Jesus Christ and the events of his death and resurrection, and will be completed in that future world which is promised us.

It is this which forms the matter of Scripture. Its first pages tell of the creation of heaven and earth, its last of the new heavens and the new earth. Between this beginning and ending is contained this whole, full history, whose central point is the cross. The cross casts a light upon all that precedes and follows it. Jesus Christ, crucified and risen, is the end towards which all the ways of Divine revelation tend, and from which they again proceed. He is the centre, the essence of the whole Bible. All that is in it has a reference to Him—now more nearly, now more distantly,—and hence some parts are more and some are less important; but all are connected with Him, and therefore should be profitable to us. All Scripture testifies of Him, and ‘all Scripture is given by inspira-

tion of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' (2 Tim. iii. 16.) ✓

Under this light must all that Scripture contains be viewed. From this central point and aim must all be *understood*.

We hear much of the obscurity of Scripture, and this is often advanced as a reason for neglecting it.

It is true that we must bring a certain degree of historical knowledge to its perusal, to be able to understand its details; but this is more or less necessary to the complete understanding of any book relating to historical events, whether of the present or the past. And even when we understand ever so clearly the historical circumstances to which the details refer, and are ever so skilful in the language, there will still be much that will remain obscure to every reader. We theologians best know this, and the history of biblical interpretation bears witness to it. This obscurity lies not only in the difficulties presented by the language, or in the want of the necessary historical knowledge, but still more in the matter itself. But even if a greater portion were sealed to us, we might still say, with far more justice than Socrates, when speaking of the writings of the heathen philosopher, Heraclitus, surnamed the Obscure, 'What I understand of them is so excellent, that I can draw conclusions from it concerning what I do not understand.' And the deeper we dive into Scripture, the more we shall

understand it. It is the case with every really great work, that it ever becomes increasingly valuable and important to us. A work which a first perusal will exhaust, can have no very special fulness and profundity; while one which is ever disclosing new thoughts and beauties, is alone of real importance. The Bible is an inexhaustible treasury. The New Testament may be classed among the smallest of books. We can carry it in our pockets. And yet, though it has been studied, explained, and preached upon for eighteen hundred years, who can say he has mastered it? Only the superficial could imagine such a thing. It is, as Luther once said, like a great tree, on which, when we have shaken and beaten it ever so much, we still find fruit.

We must, indeed, bring a right state of heart and mind to the Scriptures, if we are to understand them. Susceptibility is a necessary ingredient to comprehension. They who would understand a poet must, as Goethe says, go into the poet's country. And they who would understand the book of religion, must bring a mind open to its reception. As God only speaks in Nature to those who know Him, and have eyes and ears for His manifestation therein, so they alone hear His voice in Scripture whose hearts are open to His revelation. If any one fails to find God therein, it is no fault of Scripture; it is not sealed; it is his heart which is closed against it. In order to understand it, we must take up a right position with respect to it. We must surrender ourselves to it, with an absence of

self-opinion, desiring only to hear what it has to say to us, and not to find ourselves in it. It has been often said, that the Bible is the book in which every one finds what he chooses. Certainly, he who desires to find his own notions in it will so find them. But is this the fault of Scripture, or of the man who would find without seeking, who first brings in what he afterwards brings out? The best remedy for this abuse of Scripture, is Scripture itself. We need but to search it with an absence of self-opinion, and a desire of discovering what it contains. This is the testimony of Jesus Christ, the history of God's revealed way of salvation; and this is what we want.

The Church of Rome requires that Scripture should be interpreted according to tradition, according to the teaching of the Church. But what if tradition is discordant? What if the Church's teaching is unscriptural? No one can find the Romish mass in the Scriptures who does not first place it there, and no one can support the latest dogma of the Romish Church by Scripture without misinterpreting it. This, then, is no remedy for arbitrary interpretation. In fact, there is no external remedy for error and self-will, but only an inward, moral, and spiritual one. The remedy for an arbitrary spirit is obedience to the truth, the subjection of self to the Word of truth; and the remedy for error is the gradual conquest of error by the Spirit, who, by means of Scripture, leads from one truth to another. It is our own fault, and not the fault of Scripture, if we fail of attaining a right knowledge of

truth. For in it is deposited, as in the great archives of the kingdom of God, His whole revelation. Hence it is at all times the Church's safe guide in all dangers and duties. <sup>(14)</sup>

Is it, then, thus certain and reliable? This is disputed. Certainly, if Scripture is to be a correct and trustworthy account of the great drama of the Divine revelation, as we believe, and as the Church at all times has believed, it cannot have originated in the fallible human mind, but must be in truth the Word of that same Spirit who effected and presides over the revelation itself. If Scripture is, as we believe, a necessity for the Church, then is it also both the demand and the conviction of faith, that God would not leave it to accident whether such Scripture should be produced, nor commit its composition merely to men, but would Himself ordain and effect its existence. It is not a fact originated by the choice of man, not merely a work of the human mind, but of the Spirit of God, *i.e.*, it is inspired. The whole Christian Church believes in and teaches the Divine inspiration of Holy Scripture. The New Testament asserts it of the Old; the Lord and His apostles often designate the latter as the Word and Work of the Holy Ghost; and the Church believes the same of the New Testament, for this is even more perceptibly pervaded by the presence of the Spirit of God.

Recently, however, the doctrine of *the Divine inspiration of Holy Scripture* has been made the subject of special attack.



Do we understand inspiration aright? It does not mean that no room is left for the agency of the human mind. To maintain this is to refute what is evident. The Biblical historians made researches, collected, and sifted, as other historians do. The prophets, as Luther says, studied the more ancient Scriptures. And when the Apostle Paul writes one of his epistles, all his mental powers are as much at a stretch as when he delivers one of his great speeches, such as that before the Areopagus at Athens (Acts xvii). The doctrine of the Divine inspiration of Scripture is not to be understood as excluding the agency of the human mind. The authors of the books of the Bible are authors, and not mere scribes. What they wrote was not dictated to their pens, but passed through their own minds. Yet it was no mere production of their own minds, but they were moved and filled by the Spirit of God; and it was out of this Spirit that they spoke and wrote. The Spirit of God presided over their mental activity by revealing truth, illuminating their minds, and directing their thoughts and words, so that they said the right thing in the right words; and so said it that it was adapted to the use, not only of their own times, but of the Church at all times. The fact that the Holy Spirit acted upon their minds did not spare their labour, but required it. God did not treat them as mere machines, for it was only by the most concentrated energy of their own minds that they became organs of the Spirit that He speaks to us through their minds. And that which He thus

speaks to us is not arbitrary instruction and information, but the revelation of salvation and the Divine purpose to bless us. Scripture is not a collection of human sciences, but the Divine charter. It will not spare us the labour of investigation in matters of secular science, but it will answer our inquiries concerning the way of salvation; it will afford us no solutions to the problems of physical science, but it will furnish us with the solutions which we need concerning God's purposes of mercy; it will not teach us,—as Cardinal Baronius says,—how heaven moves, but it will teach us how to get there. It was for this purpose that it was inspired by God. <sup>(15)</sup>

But are these things so? Can we be *certain* of this inspiration? It is a critical question, but we are able to give an affirmative answer.

This certainty has its degrees.

When we approach the Scriptures, and give ourselves to their contemplation, the first thing which produces an overpowering effect is their magnificent unity, their wonderful harmony. We admire a Gothic cathedral, the splendour of the original conception, the richness, the consistency, the adaptation and harmoniousness of its several parts. Holy Scripture is such a cathedral, and more than this. It includes the greatest variety. In it is contained a multiplicity of ideas, of knowledge, of facts. But one thought runs through the whole. It is the same religious spirit which breathes upon us in all its several parts. It is one and the same teaching which it carries on in all its

several books ; one and the same truth which it everywhere proclaims ; one and the same way of salvation which it everywhere bids us walk in ; one and the same purpose of God for our eternal happiness which it everywhere declares, with greater or less distinctness, and in various stages of accomplishment, but ever one and the same. This unity of Scripture cannot but excite both wonder and admiration, when we consider that we have here, in fact, the whole national literature of Israel, a literature descending from remote ages, diffused over a period of about 1600 years, the work of the most diverse authors, written under the most widely differing circumstances and events, for the most opposite purposes, in the greatest variety of form—and yet what wonderful unity of spirit and opinion ! Where, in the whole world, where, in the whole circle of literature, can anything be found which even distantly approaches it ?

Nor is it this unity only, but still more the harmony existing between its different parts, which excites our admiration. Scripture forms one great whole. It is not like a collection of writings—it is like a single book ; it is an organism in which each part is necessary, and none incidental or superfluous, but each serviceable to the whole, from the first page to the last, from the creation to the renewal of the world ; and the centre of this great whole is Jesus Christ and His cross. We cannot but confess this is not the work of men. For they who wrote the several parts often knew nothing of each other ; they knew nothing of

that whole for which they were labouring. Neither accident nor human intention brought this to pass, but a higher mind. Scripture is a wonderful structure—a structure to which there must have been an architect. And this was the over-ruling Spirit who used the services of individuals. <sup>(16)</sup>

And every one may experience that this Spirit here speaks to us with primitive power and truth. A series of Christian writings, from the period immediately following that of the New Testament writings, has come down to us : an epistle of Clement of Rome, a disciple of St Paul, to the Corinthians, written in the first century ; letters of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch ; a letter of the venerable Polycarp of Smyrna, one of St John's disciples ; and various others. No one can read these writings of the disciples of the apostles, of the most respected Christian teachers and representatives of the Church of their age, without being struck with astonishment at the wonderful difference between the New Testament Scriptures and these writings of apostolic disciples. Even a Schelling found in this remarkable difference, the strongest proof of the inspiration of the New Testament. <sup>(17)</sup>

Thus, then, has the Church in all ages testified to Scripture not only as a proclamation of the truth, but as its primitive and standard proclamation to all ages. Never has the Church hesitated in her confidence in Holy Writ. Ever has she lived in the certainty of possessing therein that Word of God which she needs. And this her certainty is no arbitrary idea,

no unfounded assertion, but the universal belief of all Christians and of all Churches ; universal, because inseparable from the very nature of the Church herself. And this her faith is no product of her own reasoning ; it is effected in her by the Spirit of God, by that same Spirit who produced the Scriptures, that they might furnish the Church, which is his creation, with the light she needs. As the Spirit of God testifies to our spirit that the proclamation of Jesus Christ is the truth which will save us, so has the same Spirit ever testified to the Church that the word of Scripture is that word of God which will guide her into all truth. And this faith has been progressively confirmed to Christendom. Men have experienced, in the course of ages, that they really possess in Scripture what faith assured them that they did, viz., the sure guide and unerring standard of God's word. The history of Scripture is but a history of its progressive corroboration. <sup>(18)</sup>

And having this experience, she will not let herself be led astray ; her faith will not be shaken even by modern *criticism*.

Allow me a few words on this subject.

We live in the age of criticism. Many have had their faith in Scripture shaken by criticism, but without reason ; for what is it that is objected to Scripture ? Is it replied, that its matter is a stumbling block ? We ask : Why ? Because it speaks of the sun in a manner inconsistent with the Copernican system ? Scripture is not designed to make us astronomers, but Christians.

Or because it contradicts history? On the contrary, historical researches corroborate Scriptural statements. There was a time when the narrative of the sojourning of Israel in Egypt was regarded as a fable. Now the papyrus rolls and ancient wall paintings of Egypt testify to its reality; and in the Pillar Court of the Berlin Museum there is an ancient sitting figure of King Rameses II., which was undoubtedly beheld by Moses.<sup>(19)</sup> Doubt has been cast upon the accuracy of the descriptions of Nineveh in the book of Jonah, and of the Babylonian court in that of Daniel; but the researches of our days have only served to confirm them.<sup>(20)</sup> And if we descend to the New Testament, every well-informed man must confess that its descriptions fully correspond with what he elsewhere learns of the historical condition of its era.<sup>(21)</sup>

Objections have been made to the matter of Holy Scripture. Objections of taste: But what is more subjective than taste? It is well known that Frederick II. of Prussia pronounced the plays of Shakespeare barbarous. We think rather differently of them now. Objections in a moral point of view:<sup>(22)</sup> But it is indisputable that Scripture is a source of moral renovation. Objections to the miracles it narrates:<sup>(23)</sup> But this is a cardinal question, in which different views of the universe are concerned.

Modern investigation has especially delighted to occupy itself in inquiry as to the periods and authors of the several books of the Bible. And it is chiefly the results, the real or supposed results, of such in-



vestigations which have caused anxiety to many minds. But such anxiety is needless. There are few provinces of mental activity in which errors more easily occur than in that of literary criticism. Philologists, whose special concern such criticism is, will readily confirm this. Schleiermacher was versed, as few others have been, in the writings of Plato, and yet he erroneously rejected many of Plato's discourses. And shall we theologians be free from this law of error in the province of biblical criticism? And even if a negative criticism should be correct in many instances, this alone does not touch our faith. The five books of Moses retain their value and importance, even if we were obliged to concede to criticism that longer or shorter component parts were added by other men of God to what Moses himself wrote, that this work might thus attain the completeness which was necessary, if it was to fulfil its purpose for the Church of after ages. Our faith does not depend upon the decision of the question: Whether the Gospel according to St Matthew, in the form in which we possess it, is the work of St Matthew himself. I believe that it is so; but it would not, in the slightest degree, affect my faith if I were forced to yield to the conviction, that the earlier sketch made by this apostle had been enlarged by additional narratives of events in the life of Christ by some other witness of the apostolic era. I cite these examples to show that the question of authorship alone, is not a question of faith. Certainly this has its limits; and these are, when the

genuineness of the book, or its utterances concerning itself, are impeached. To all criticism which denies these, we will oppose the impression made by Scripture upon every unprejudiced reader, that the very Spirit of truth is here addressing us with a power and purity nowhere else met with, and will then put more faith in this spirit of truth in Scripture than in the arguments of criticism.<sup>(24)</sup> And even if we were obliged, which we are not, to give up one or more books of the Bible, our faith would not be given up with them. One school of criticism,—the so-called Tübingen school,—has left us but four of all the Pauline epistles, that to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, and that to the Galatians. Yet we maintain that, if we had but these four, we should still have the whole of Christianity. We might lament that we had no more, but we should be able to obtain from these an adequate knowledge of Jesus Christ, of His redemption, and of our salvation. But, thank God, we have more. It is now universally acknowledged that this school of criticism has dealt far too arbitrarily, and uprooted far too rashly. Much will certainly have to be admitted which criticism is now perhaps questioning. A true and a still seasonable saying was written twenty-seven years ago by the venerable Roman Catholic theologian Hug, in his remarks on the Strauss's 'Leben Jesu' of his days (p. 59): 'It has become customary among us, for any one who desires to earn the fame of scholar, in the department of theology, to bring into the market something striking and audacious concerning the

sacred records of our faith, and to outdo all his predecessors in this kind of ware. Audacity supplies the place of solidity. A sharp and flippant proposition, which stakes everything, will procure fame among us, just as a well-applied witticism will in France.'

We should not find these attacks so imposing, if we were more familiar with Scripture, if we were more at home in it. And Scripture was given us for this very purpose, that we should make our hearts and minds intimately acquainted with it, and not that we should regard and treat it merely as an object of critical operations. Scripture is supported by a very fertile history—a history not merely of the criticism it has undergone, and from which it has ever come forth victorious, but of the experience which has been made of it by the Church. During the course of ages, the Church has not become less certain, but more certain, about the Scriptures; and they who take up a right position with respect to them, will share in this experience of the Church, and progressively increase in affection for them. It is true, in all cases, that love grows in the way of duty. Our duty to the Scriptures is to read them and live in them; and this, too, is the way of attaining certainty concerning them.

And whom does it more become to be intimate with Holy Scripture than us, the Protestant Christians of Germany? Luther's translation of the Bible is the pride of our nation and the pearl of our literature. It has bestowed upon our people, that language in which

our greatest intellects have written and spoken. It has made the Bible a national book, in a degree which it never was before. It is the common ground on which men of all ranks, and of every degree of cultivation, from the highest to the very lowest, meet. The Bible forms an intellectual bond between all classes of our people, in a far greater degree than the poems of Homer did among the Greeks. And what a bond ! It is in the highest concerns of the soul, in the greatest questions of the intellect, in the holiest thoughts and feelings, that we here find a meeting place. Here, too, it is that our souls ever meet with new refreshment. Scripture is a fountain of living water, in which our souls may bathe. Hither let us resort from the distractions of the world, from the noisy pursuits of the age, from the strife of thought and feeling ; here will our souls be tranquillised, here are we surrounded by the breath of eternity, here is the sanctuary of God. Let us learn to live in the Scriptures, and thus shall we learn also to love the Scriptures.

And the more we lovingly dive into them and make them the nourishment of our spirits, the more will they awaken within us desires for that Divine grace of which they testify, and which draws near to us in those means of grace which the Church is appointed to administer, namely, in the preaching of the Word and in the Sacraments.

## LECTURE IX.

### THE CHURCH'S MEANS OF GRACE.



THE purpose of God is our salvation, *i.e.*, our communion with Himself. It is this for which we were destined, and in which we find our truth. By the Person and work of Christ this salvation was effected, the Church possesses this treasure, and Scripture furnishes documentary evidence concerning it. What is here presented to us externally, must now be made our own inward possession.

But as it is with Christianity, so is it with the individual Christian. The world could receive Christianity, but could not itself produce it. It was a new act of God, effected in the sphere of history ; and the Christian is no less a work of God in the sphere of life. Christianity is a new creative principle in the history of the world : hence a new creative spiritual power must enter into combination with our moral life, if we are to be Christians. This is the nature of grace and of its agency in man. It is not merely a doctrine, an admonition, or a precept ; it does not merely set up an ideal, and give us new ideas ; it is an operative fact, a creative power which takes possession of our mind and will, and calls forth new thoughts and emo-

tions within us. It is true that it does not enter into our inner life without means. It has its preparatives, its points of connection ; it enters into combination with the productions of our own moral efforts and powers. It is no production of our own moral power, but is a revival thereof. We can long for it, but we cannot procure it ; it must draw near to us and impart itself to us. It is true that it does not carry on its work without us, for it carries it on within us. The moral work which each man has to do cannot be done for him by another, not even by God ; he must perform it himself. Nevertheless, all our fellow-working with God rests upon the foundation laid by the work of God within us. God himself must begin that which is new within us, must deposit in us its germ, must impart to us the new moral power. As redemption through Jesus Christ was the act and work of God without us, so is the appropriation of redemption His work within us. It is the Spirit of God which works upon our spirits.

All the intellectual activity of man, all influence of one man upon another, requires its appropriate instrumentality. The two great means by which man works upon man are his word and his deed. And the Spirit of God, too, clothes Himself in these forms, and makes them the means of His grace : word and transaction. The Church has ever designated these two *the Word and Sacraments*, as the means of grace by which the agency of the Spirit of God approaches and enters into us.



The power of mind is greater upon earth than physical power, and it has ever been new and great thoughts which have set the world in motion. All other powers and forces do but subserve the power of mind. When the proud structures which absolute power or armed force has erected are overthrown and in ruins, mind rises above the ruins, and bears its thoughts from century to century. They alone endure; all else decays. They are the instruments which convey the produce of history to succeeding generations. They form a communication between minds separated from each other by millenaries. They constitute the projectile force of the mind, awaken the energy of the will, and kindle that fire of enthusiasm which is the soul of all great deeds, and the secret of success. But the outward form of mind, and the garment in which thought clothes itself, is speech.

Speech is the revelation of the mind by which it becomes incorporate. The revelation of God also has from the beginning clothed itself in speech. *The word* is become the expression for revelation itself. Truly mind can clothe itself in various forms; it can choose anything as its means for speaking to us and influencing us. It addresses us by the whole wide world of symbolism. But still speech is its most appropriate incorporation; and to all else which it uses to express its intimations, to all signs and symbolism, the interpreting word must first draw near and liberate the mind which is, so to speak, confined within the visible form of the sign, before it can thereby speak to our

mind. Hence it is speech which is the means of mental intercourse, and the power of mental influence. It is true that there is also a speechless intercourse and a silent influence. But these, too, rest upon words. Words form, between mind and mind, the tie of connection which then carries on its work in silence.

Hence when God would show to men the purposes of His heart for their salvation, and deliver their souls from the evil of sin, He revealed Himself by His word. At every stage of His revelation we see a fresh word of God uniting itself to what had been as yet delivered, and carrying it still farther onwards. It was thus that the word and its effects were propagated from generation to generation. Upon this word, then, rests in the first instance, the written record, that the word delivered might be verified and renewed to each age. Every præ-Christian word of God had for its object Him who is called 'The Word'—even Christ Jesus. When the evangelist sought the most comprehensive, the fullest expression for Jesus Christ, he called Him simply 'The Word' (John i. 1). That is to say: He is the absolute revelation. In Him God has laid up and expressed to us His whole heart, His whole will towards us. He who is the substance of the Old Testament, and the soul of the New, is simply the Word, the absolute revelation of God. The form, however, of His revelation, and the means of His agency, was again the word, into which He inwrought His very being.

It is true that Jesus did also signs and miracles, and that His very appearance exercised a powerful influence upon the minds of those susceptible of it. But when He would pour forth His whole heart, and seize men's hearts and stir them to their very depths, He clothed His testimony in word. And it was this, His word, which gave to His signs and wonders, and to His acts their special significance and influence. We all know what heart-stirring power dwelt in the words of the Lord Jesus. And it was the word which He pointed out to His disciples as the power by which they were to lift the world off its hinges. Their office was to be the preaching of the Word: 'Go and teach all nations;' 'Preach the Gospel to every creature.' And since the time of that first preaching, on the day of Pentecost, the proclamation of the word has been going on throughout the world.

The word is the power of the Church. When the knights of Germany offered their swords to Luther in behalf of his cause, he refused them, with the declaration: The Word shall do it.<sup>(1)</sup>

The Word, besides being the power of the Church, is the means by which it is to be extended. Many a time, indeed, have ambition and selfishness entered into alliance with the missionary work of the Church, and placed their secular resources at her disposal. Yet the preaching of the word has ever been the special power of missions. When the Gospel is carried to the heathen, it brings not merely religion but civilisation. Missions are of eminent importance with regard to

civilisation, of far greater than those imagine who despise them and stigmatise them as the work of pietism. And the medium of all this salutary agency is, in truth, the word.

The word approaches us in various ways. When the mother teaches her child to pray, or explains Bible pictures to him; when the teacher of the young gives instruction in Bible history; when from the professor's chair we develop before our young theologians the mysteries of Christian doctrine; or when I speak to you here on matters of Christian faith,—all these are but the announcement of the Word in various ways. But its special form still is its public declaration by *preaching*. It is here that it concentrates its whole strength, and will exercise its full influence.

But then it must be really the preaching of the Word of God. It must be no mere twisting and turning of phrases, no dressing up of the dry chips of human wisdom, no exhibition of the preacher's own wisdom, intellect, or eloquence. We are to preach, not ourselves and our gifts or our poverty, but the Word of God, *i.e.*, Christ Jesus. Nor are men to want to hear us, and our thoughts or smooth words, but the Word of God, *i.e.*, Jesus Christ. But when preaching is really what it ought to be, it is the fittest, most special, and most efficient form of the word of God.

Preaching was the chief occupation of Christ during His earthly life, and He appointed preaching to be

the chief duty of His disciples after His ascension. Preaching was the office of the great prophets of the Old Testament; preaching was the business of Christ's apostles; the religions of the ancient world and their opposition to Christianity were overcome by the power of preaching; and the history of the Church has told us of many who have wielded this sword of the Spirit with wide-reaching effect. Preaching is a heart-stirring, a world-stirring power. Luther's preaching introduced and long gave a tone to a new era, while at the same time it kindled new light and life in the souls of individuals, and poured into the minds of the desponding, the consolations of Divine grace. Hence our Church has above all others designated and treated preaching as the chief matter in public worship, or at least has insisted that it should be so treated by those who are called upon to preach. It is true that the public delivery of sermons is not the only preaching. Nature, too, preaches to us; the religious decorations of our churches and of our houses preach to us. But the means by which God most specially and directly speaks to us, Spirit to spirit, Heart to heart, is still by His word; and the most special form of that word is its public preaching by His ministers.

What, then, is the subject matter of the word? It may be a single text which strikes us. Perhaps in our case one single element of truth may carry all before it and set the final seal to a long course of preparation. Yet still we need the whole Word, that whole Word which is made up of *Law and Gospel*.

If we are to be possessed of a sound Christianity, and fully to appropriate the blessing of redemption, both must produce their appropriate effect upon us.

With the whole human race, no less than with each individual, God deals in the way of a progressive course of instruction. History is the education of the human race; and this law of the whole is repeated in the case of the individual. Now the moral law of all education is: through Law to Liberty! When the evangelist would point out the contrast between the Old and New Testaments, he says: 'The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.' When the Apostle Paul would characterise the difference of the Old and New Testament ages, he designates it by the words Law and Liberty; and it is a fundamental doctrine of our Church to give due emphasis to this difference between the law and the Gospel. Certainly they stand not merely in contrast, but also in relation to each other. The Apostle Paul calls the law our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. Thus it is that the law subserves the gospel, and leads us beyond itself to the liberty of the Gospel. Yet still this relation in which they stand to each other depends upon their difference. We all know that a new age began with Christianity. The age of the law gave place to the age of grace. True it is that God has been in all ages the God of Grace, and that we find the Gospel already in the Old Testament. The very soul of the Old Testament is the promise of Christ. Yet it is still only a promise. The Gospel is



the future of the Old Testament, the law its present. When we read the precepts of the law in the Old Testament, it may perhaps seem to us incomprehensible why they should extend to all those details and externals which are, according to our notions, so indifferent, instead of being confined to great moral truths. It would be incomprehensible, nay, it would be arbitrary, if the law had not been intended to serve an educational purpose. It was to be felt as law; it was to be a yoke upon the neck; it was to demand the allegiance of the whole man, to confine every step, every action of the whole life, within the bounds of obedience. We often command certain things to our own children which are not necessary. It may be perhaps indifferent in itself whether they do this or that; yet, because we have commanded it, they are to do it,—not for the sake of the thing itself, but for the sake of our command. They must learn obedience. A time may perhaps come to them, too, when they may be delivered from this strict discipline of law, and act as they like; but not till they are ripe for this liberty. It is the very use of law to ripen them for it. Law is needful to us all. It is said in Scripture (Lam. iii. 27): ‘It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth.’ He who has not learned to obey has not learned to command. He whose self-will is not restrained and broken in his youth, will not in after years know how to make a wise use of liberty. The law is a necessary stage of moral development. If any one overleaps it, or would, from false

tenderness, exempt another from it, an undisciplined and arbitrary character will be the result. It is, however the high road to freedom. Many, indeed, never get beyond the law; they always remain under the law, either in their external or their inner life. But they ought to get beyond it, and be free from it; as the apostle expresses it: through the law to die to the law.

How, then, does the law serve to lead us on beyond itself? Its first office is to bring us under discipline. It restrains the outbreking of our passions, and opposes its prohibitions to their motions. We must learn to control ourselves and our appetites by the power of our will. Law, cannot, indeed, annihilate our appetites, nor of itself exterminate our sinful inclinations. Laws cannot change the heart; inclination cannot be commanded, nor love prescribed. The law is not a remedy against sin, it only makes us conscious thereof; for it just when we strive to control ourselves, and to bring ourselves into subjection to the commandment, that we feel most forcibly the opposition offered by our sinful inclination. He who deals most strictly with himself, most feels and acknowledges his impotence against that power of sin which rules within. It is true that we ought to labour diligently in the work; but all our strictness with ourselves, and all our moral effort, will not change us. We ought to contend against our faults, and to strive after virtue; but when we have conquered ever so many faults, and acquired ever so many virtues, and done ever so many good works, and are ever so law-observing in our whole

deportment, we do not thereby become other men. Certainly, it is better to make serious resolutions than to lead a life of thoughtlessness and frivolity. But good resolutions alone will not bring a man to heaven. It is a pleasant thing to behold youthful enthusiasm following after the moral ideal ever hovering before its eyes, and rising above that low level of morality to which so many of our young people have sunk. There is something lovable in the noble moral efforts of youth. You all know the narrative of the rich young man in the Gospel, who approached our Lord with the question, 'What must I do to inherit eternal life?' He was such a youth, a youth filled with enthusiasm for the ideal. And there stirred within the Lord's heart, as there does in ours, the feeling of delight at the moral nobility of human nature. He beheld the youth, we are told (Mark x. 21), and loved him. And yet this very history shows that the moral ideal alone cannot help us. We can never thereby overcome the discord which we bear within us. I am bold to appeal to the experience of every one who has trodden it, whether the path of his own moral effort has led to true freedom. You know what was the moral development of the ancient world. Does there exist a more sublime or nobler moral enthusiasm than we meet with in Plato's moral speculations, and in his ideal of the true and good under the form of beauty? And what is it, in the ancient world of Greece and Rome, which so powerfully kindles our youthful ardour, and will continue to betray the youthful mind into en-

thusiasm so long as it is true to itself? What but that ideal atmosphere of moral beauty by which that ever youthful world is pervaded, that noble spirit of moral effort and moral struggle which appeals to our mind in the deeds of its great men? And yet to what did the old world attain? It was her office, after having developed and exhausted all the possibilities latent in human nature, to recognise its impotence. It was, and continues to be her office, to be an ever loud-tongued memento of human limitation. <sup>(2)</sup> I say nothing of that defilement of sin into which so many sank. I am now speaking only of her nobler representatives; and the lower we descend the stream of time, the more numerous are the voices bewailing the unhappy discord which we are incapable of overcoming. <sup>(3)</sup>

The experience of all who have trodden this path is: we would, yet cannot; we will, and yet we will not; we struggle to be free, yet are not free; we are ever making new resolutions, and yet never fulfilling them. ‘Oh, wretched man that I am!’ exclaims the Apostle Paul, in that touching lament in the seventh chapter of Romans, in which he is describing this inward discord, and the impotence of his own will in respect of the ascendancy of nature’s sinfulness. And every one who travels by the same path reaches the same end. The experience of all who walk therein is: We have felt profoundly unhappy. <sup>(4)</sup> And so it was meant we should; for this is the end of the Law. When this is reached the Gospel steps in. ‘When

the fulness of the time was come,' says the apostle, 'God sent forth His Son' (Gal. iv. 4). He means the time of the law. Both Israel and the heathen world had their time of law. What the Mosaic law was to Israel, the ideal of philosophic morality was to the heathen world. When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, is repeated also in the case of every individual. When the law has fulfilled its office in him, it gives place to the Gospel.

The Gospel is Jesus Christ. He is the substance of Christian preaching. He preached Himself, His apostles preached Him, and we, too, preach Him.

What is meant by preaching Jesus Christ? It is to preach the grace of God, the forgiveness of sin, and peace of conscience. When we try to state what was the very essence of Christ's preaching, we mention such sayings as: 'Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest' (Matt. xi. 28); or such words of comfort as He spake to the 'woman which was a sinner:' 'Go in peace; thy sins are forgiven; thy faith hath saved thee' (Luke vii. 48-50); or if we were thinking of parables, that prince of parables, the Prodigal Son (Luke xv). When we inquire what was the essence of apostolic preaching, St Paul answers us: 'We preach Christ crucified;' 'I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified' (1 Cor. i. 23; ii. 2). The preaching of the cross, however, is the preaching of reconciliation: 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their

trespasses unto them ; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us : we pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin ; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him' (2 Cor. v. 19-21). When we inquire, moreover, what was the preaching of Luther, and what is the fundamental doctrine of our Church, we find it in accordance with the teaching of the Apostle Paul, to be : *justification by faith* ; in other words, the appropriation of reconciliation, *i.e.*, of the forgiveness of sins, and Divine adoption, by the believing reception of the grace of God. This it is to preach Christ.

It is true that the doctrine of justification through faith has ever been accused of being prejudicial to morality, of separating religion from practice, of weakening moral seriousness and zeal. Even St Paul had to experience such attacks, and they formed the object against which the battle of his life had to be waged. Not faith, but works, said his opponents, are the way of salvation. Faith and works, said a subsequent age. Not faith, but reason, says rationalism. Not faith only, but above all feeling and the works proceeding from love, teaches the Church of Rome.

While the Romanist says : justification is to be attained in the way of sanctification ; we say : sanctification is to be attained in the way of justification. Not till we are certain of His mercy, shall we be able



to give to God the glad affection of our hearts! Not till we are reconciled to God, can we live in friendship with Him; and all holy obedience is but a grateful response to the gift of His grace. But it is by faith alone that we become certain of His grace. Such is the teaching of our Church.<sup>(5)</sup> For the heaviest burden which oppresses us is guilt, and the consciousness of guilt; and the first and foremost of all our wants is, forgiveness of sins and certainty of God's mercy.

It is said that the doctrine of justification is prejudicial to morality, and yet it is an expression of moral seriousness. For the degree of the strength and vitality of each man's moral consciousness is the standard of his morality. Moral consciousness however, feels first of all the guilt of sin, and then its power; feels it first as the burden which oppresses the conscience, then as the power which controls the will. Before our will can undertake the work of reformation, at least before it can undertake it with joy and with the prospect of success, our conscience must know and feel itself free from the burden of guilt. We must have the right to forget the things which are behind, that we may reach forth to those things that are before. God, however, alone can give us the right to forget our sin; for it is against Him only that we have sinned. It is He only who can forgive us, and not we ourselves. We must have His forgiveness, if our hearts are to feel health and freedom.

When a child has offended its parents, it seeks forgiveness before it begins a new life. Until it

receives pardon it is unhappy, the burden of guilt oppresses it, nor can it cheerfully enter upon a fresh course of conduct. Its first, its chief desire, is pardon. Even if it is punished, it knows that this does not undo its fault; even then its deepest want is forgiveness. Nor does it expect forgiveness because it promises future amendment, for it is at all times bound by its duty to its parents and to God to do what is right. Not without amendment, yet not because of amendment, does it receive forgiveness,—a forgiveness bestowed only because the parents choose of their free kindness to bestow it. It is true that it is morally impossible for us to assure our children of forgiveness unless we see in them an earnest purpose of amendment; but the reason of pardon lies not in the child but in the parents.

So, too, in our case. It is not that we make amends for our sin and guilt by our good works or good dispositions. We can make no amends, for we owe the very best that we can either will or do. It is not because we promise improvement, not because we condemn our sin and inwardly forsake it, not because our dispositions are changed and our hearts converted, that God forgives us. We cannot earn forgiveness, we cannot deserve it. It is God's free gift, but a gift which He will not bestow unless a change of disposition takes place in us. An earnest purpose of amendment is indeed a condition of forgiveness, but it is not its reason. The reason of forgiveness is in God alone and in His free mercy. It is this which forgives us

for the sake of Christ and His redemption. It is through this that God's holiness has made it possible to itself to forgive us. But it is our faith which lays hold upon this grace, for it is a faith in the grace of reconciliation. It is by faith that we obtain forgiveness ; for, as Luther says : What thou believest, that thou hast. Not that the reason of forgiveness lies in our faith, as though it were so meritorious an act, so good a work, that God must reward it ; nor in our love which proceeds from faith, nor in our repentance which begets it ; it is not in us, but only in God and in the atoning death of Jesus Christ. It is grace alone, and nothing else, which induces God to pronounce our pardon and to receive us as His children. It is this which, with the Apostle Paul, we call justification, *i.e.*, acquittal from all guilt and punishment, and admission to the rights of sonship. Not because we are not sinners, but though we are sinners ; nay, just because we are sinners, and believe in His pardoning grace, are we pronounced free, guiltless, and just, and received into favour.

Justification, then, is not a change which takes place in us, but, if we may so speak, an occurrence which takes place in God, a change in the sentence He passes upon us, in his view of us, in our value in His sight. He chooses to regard and treat us as His children ; for the Spirit of God bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God,—bears this witness through the word of God, which addresses us in those loving terms : My son, my

daughter, be of good comfort, thy sins are forgiven thee ; thy faith hath made thee whole. Thus does the Spirit, by means of the word, produce in our hearts the glad, the God-reposed assurance which a Christian must possess if he is to live and die as a Christian should ; for from this alone can grow a happy child-like love to God, a grateful obedience in life, and a joyful hope in death. This is the aim of God's word, and this is its victorious achievement.

In the case, indeed, of each individual Christian, this assurance passes through many fluctuations, and is subject even to declensions and revivals. But the word of God is stronger than our weakness ; and it brings with it those accompaniments of the word which God has ordained to assist its operation and to help the weakness of our faith, namely, *the Sacraments*.

What are the Sacraments ?

They are, first, symbolical actions.

No religion is without symbols, nor is the Christian religion. Symbolism meets a want of human nature. For we are not pure spirit, the body is itself a symbol of the spirit, and all nature a symbol of the supersensible world. Puritanism, which is acquainted only with bare walls, mistakes human nature and its wants. Truth chooses to assume a visible appearance, and the word clothes itself in a form which strikes the senses. (6) Our whole life is interwoven with symbolism. The thoughts of our minds, the inclinations of our hearts, all seek a symbolical expression. And why should not those of our religious life ? No worship can

exist without symbolism. All worship is a sacred symbolism. And do we not involuntarily carry symbolism into our whole life? When we fold our hands, when we bow or raise our heads, when we bend our knees—what are these but symbolical actions, sensible expressions of that which is not sensible? We ever delight in surrounding ourselves with what is symbolical. We have made the cross the universal symbol of Christendom. Every picture of our Saviour is a symbol. Nay, there is symbolism in all art, for it seeks to represent the invisible world of mind in visible pictures. The more elevated its subject, the more is art a mere indication of its subject. Never will a painter succeed in adequately depicting the grace and truth that shone in the countenance of Jesus Christ. All true art contains an element of symbolism. It is by this very feature that it becomes a guide to lead us out of this visible into the invisible world. (7) And we need such helps even in religion. No religion is without symbols nor is the Christian religion.

But a symbolical action is a higher or more concentrated kind of symbolism than a symbolical object. We find symbolical acts in every religion, and also in the Christian religion. They are involuntary. If I bless another, I involuntarily place my hand upon his head. Worship is a system of symbolical actions, and so too is Christian worship. Where they are absent, it becomes cold and bare. They meet a want of our nature. There is, however, a difference between the præ-Christian and Christian religions. The former



were the religions of prediction ; the latter is the religion of fulfilment. The symbols of Christianity do not direct us to something which is future, and beyond themselves ; but they speak to us of that which is present, and which the highest of symbols, viz., the Sacraments, bear within them. The Sacraments are symbolic actions ; but they are pregnant symbols ; they possess the thing which they signify.

We reckon but two Sacraments : Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Romish Church reckons seven—a number first established in the Middle Ages. In earlier times the number fluctuated ; for the notion of a sacrament was itself a fluctuating one. But Baptism and the Lord's Supper have ever been regarded as pre-eminent.<sup>(8)</sup> And this is the ground we go upon. We, too, have many sacred and important Church acts ; we, too, have confirmation, confession, the celebration of matrimony, the consecration of the ministers of the Church, and the pronunciation of the Church's blessing over her departed members. But none of these acts are equal in dignity and importance to Baptism and the Holy Supper. These rest on the express institution and ordainment of Christ himself ; and we believe that what they signify they also contain and impart.

Before Christ took leave of His disciples He ordained Baptism as the act by which all who desired it should be received among the number of His disciples, and into the fellowship of His future Church.<sup>(9)</sup> Baptism is the Sacrament of reception. Its external



form was not entirely new. It followed earlier ceremonies. Washings and purifications were prescribed in the Old Testament, and John the Baptist had used water-baptism as a symbol of repentance and forgiveness preparatory to the appearance of the kingdom of God. But Christ introduced new matter into this form, viz., that confession of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, which was henceforth to be combined with this rite. Baptism was to be reception into communion with the Triune God, and into participation in His salvation. But the central point of the revelation of salvation is the atonement on the Cross, the forgiveness of sins. It is this which is signified in this act. It is an emblem. Its emblematic character lies in the element employed, and in the act itself. Water is the means of purification, and the act of washing the act of purification. Baptism signifies purification from sin—not only that we are to cleanse ourselves, but that God will cleanse us.<sup>(10)</sup> But it does not merely signify this; it gives what it signifies; it lays the foundation of Christian life. A Christian life is a life of communion with God. The obstacle to this communion is the guilt of sin. Our first, our chief want, is the forgiveness of sin. Baptism is the Sacrament of the cleansing of the conscience from guilt. But it is this for the purpose of uniting us with God. The bond of our communion with God is the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of reconciliation unites Himself with the water of purification, and Baptism is the covenant of a good conscience with God.<sup>(11)</sup>

With us Baptism has become *Infant Baptism*. As long as the Church remains at the missionary stage, she naturally directs her preaching, and consequently offers her baptism, chiefly to adults. As soon, however, as she has obtained any firm footing, she looks upon such children as are born in her bosom as her own, and receives them into the communion of that salvation of which she is the bearer. In the Acts we are often told that St Paul baptised whole households. <sup>(12)</sup> For Christianity would be the soul, not merely of individual, but also of domestic life. The baptism of infants is the expression of this principle. It is true that when our children are baptized, they know nothing of the transaction; for their mental life is then still lying in that dreamy slumber from which it but gradually awakens. But still it exists, and still they belong to their God and Father. And are they not also to be brought to their Saviour? Do we not pray for our children? Do we not bear them on our hearts in intercessory prayer? And who could doubt but that this is something more than mere form and empty words? Once, when Jewish mothers brought their children to Jesus to bless them, and the disciples would have repelled them because these little children understood as yet nothing of the matter, Jesus expressly reproved them, and took the children in His arms, laid His hands upon them, and blessed them. <sup>(13)</sup> And why should not we, too, bring our children to Him, and feel certain that He receives them, and gives them His blessing? It is of this that Baptism is the expression.

Certainly, children have as yet committed no actual sin. We delight to call them innocent ; but still they belong to that human race upon which there lies the old common guilt. And that their innocence has its limits is shown as soon as the mind awakens from its first slumber, and with it all those evil tempers from which sin is developed. Children need the grace of God no less than we elders.

It is true that our children have no consciousness of what takes place at their baptism, for they have as yet no consciousness at all. But does it follow that no real transaction can therefore as yet take place within them ? Are not the germs of all its subsequent mental and physical development latent in the newly born infant ? And who could determine the time at which these really become inwardly active ? The first commencement of our inward mental life lies far beyond the boundaries of our consciousness. And even later on, how much there is which lies beyond the boundary of our consciousness and never enters into it ! The limits of our consciousness are far narrower than those of our mental and spiritual life. How manifold are the influences, the intellectual and moral influences, which we unconsciously experience ! And who would set limits to the Holy Spirit, over which it should be said that He could not pass ? Truly He has His work in the souls of children as well as in the souls of adults.

Yet we grant that this communion with God must become a matter of consciousness. And it is for this

reason that we follow Baptism by *Confirmation*,—not to complete Baptism, for it is complete already ; not to renew it, for it is a beginning once for all ; but that the baptized may express, with his own mouth, that confession of faith upon which he was baptized, that his covenant with God in Baptism may be the covenant of his conscious choice, and that he may receive a blessing at the very time of his moral development and his moral danger. With Confirmation we combine the first reception of *the Lord's Supper*, and consequent full membership in the Christian Church.

In remembrance of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, a lamb was offered every year at the feast of the Passover, and a sacred meal partaken amidst solemn rites, in commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt, and as a pledge of the gracious communion of God with His people. This custom was observed by the Lord Jesus, in company with His disciples. When He celebrated His last Passover with them, on the evening before His death, and His soul was most deeply moved by the prospect before Him—the prospect of His own death as a sacrifice for the world of sinners, the prospect of bidding farewell to His disciples whom He was leaving alone in the world—we read that he took bread, gave thanks, broke it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, ‘ Take, eat ; this is My body. In the same manner also He took the cup, after supper, and said, Take and drink ye all of it ; this cup is the new testament in My

blood, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me.' (Matt. xxvi. 26-28; Mark xiv. 22-24; Luke xxii. 19-20; 1 Cor. xi. 24-25).

So spake the Lord, and this was the legacy He left to His Church, and as such has Christendom at all times esteemed it. Christians have ever regarded the Lord's Supper as the highest of all transactions, as a most holy mystery, and have ever, in accordance with their Master's words, believed that they had therein His body and blood. Hence, the form of celebration in the ancient Church was, for the clergyman to say, at delivering the elements to each individual: The body of Christ! the blood of Christ! the receiver answering: Amen. And this is still the confession of the Church of Christ in all places. But in what sense, indeed, the Sacrament is the body and blood of Christ, is a matter of contention: and the feast of communion has become the sign of separation.

The Romish Church sinks the earthly element in the heavenly; it is miraculously changed by the consecration of the ordained priest. It is no longer bread and wine, it only seems bread and wine; it is, in truth, only the body and blood of Christ. The Reformed Church makes the earthly element only a sign and pledge of an inward spiritual communion of believers with Christ; it is not the body and blood of Christ, it only signifies and assures His body and blood, *i.e.*, communion with Christ and the fruit of His death.<sup>(14)</sup> Our Church (the Lutheran) believes

itself obliged to take Christ's words as they stand, and as St Paul understood them when he said : The bread is the communion of the body of Christ, the cup is the communion of the blood of Christ—that is to say, that the reception of bread and wine is the reception of the body and blood of Christ.

My respected hearers ! The Lord's Supper is the last legacy of the departing Saviour. Even to our natural feelings it would be a sacred thing, as the testament of a dying man. But to a Christian it is more than this ; it is the Holy of Holies of the Christian Church, which our thoughts cannot approach without awe. Whether or not our minds are capable of fully rising to it, the chief matter is to receive, with a humble and believing mind, what is here given us, and to obtain the blessing which is here offered. It is a legacy of love. We shall only be able to understand it in proportion as we seek to understand what love is. The nature of love is to give itself. Hence, we must see in the Lord's Supper love communicating itself. This is the road which our thoughts must take if they would understand this holy mystery.

The Lord took bread and wine. These are the two noblest and commonest productions of the earth for the food of man, and therefore did our Master choose them. Both of them. We have no right to omit either. No arts of reasoning can suffice to alter the testament of the Lord, and to justify the denial of the cup to the laity. <sup>(15)</sup>



Bread and wine, moreover, are viands to be partaken of. And the Lord's Supper was instituted : for reception not for adoration. Take, eat ; take, drink. We have no right to alter this appointment. <sup>(16)</sup>

They must be partaken of as an image and parable. Bread gives strength, wine gives gladness and courage. It is strength and gladness which our faith and life must derive from the Lord's Supper. What the Sacraments signify they bestow. The matter of this Sacrament is expressed by our Lord's saying concerning His body and blood : He gave His body to death for us, He shed His blood for us. But He who died upon the cross now lives in heaven, in glorified human nature. He is risen, He is gone into heaven, and has promised ; 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' He does not merely send His Spirit, He will Himself also be present with us. He, the same Jesus who once walked upon earth, who once died upon the cross, and now sits at the right hand of God, and is ever near to His people—He, the Son of Man, the exalted Saviour, will be with us, and impart Himself to us in the way of communion. We do not stand in merely spiritual but in complete communion with Him ; we do not receive merely the virtues of his Divine nature, He gives Himself to us in His human nature also. Our communion with Him is to be a complete one. This is the object of love. We must understand what love, supreme love, is, if we would understand this Sacrament.

And what is the purpose for which He gives Himself

to us ? He died upon the cross ; He is now glorified. He died to atone for our sins ; He lives glorified in Heaven that He may one day receive us into the fellowship of His life. Sin is to be forgiven us ; our future glory is to be guaranteed to us. The former is our consolation when we look back at the past, the latter is our hope when we look forward to the future. We ourselves are standing in the present. We are journeying from the world of sin to the world of future glory, from the life of death to the life of the resurrection. The Lord's Supper is the meal of our pilgrimage. When we are weary, when we feel our weakness, when the comfort of forgiveness vanishes, when our faith grows weak, and our hope faint, then let us come to this feast, then let us obtain strength and refreshment, then let the body and blood of Christ assure us that our sins are forgiven and our eternal life certain. For this purpose let us, as we eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord, show forth His death till He come (1 Cor. xi. 26). His death is our comfort, His coming our hope.

## LECTURE X.

### THE LAST THINGS.



THE subject of my present and last lecture, my respected hearers, is: *The Last Things*, i.e., the end of history and of the whole course of the world. That end is perfection—our perfection, the Church's perfection, the world's perfection. For we are to be inheritors of eternal life, the Church is to be God's perfect kingdom, the world, His imperishable and glorious world. This is the goal of all things; for the world has a goal towards which it is advancing, the history of the nations as well as of the Church, a goal which it is to attain; and our life has a goal, in reaching which it is to find rest and arrive at its truth. <sup>(1)</sup>

I would speak to you, on the present occasion, of this threefold goal.

First, a goal is set before us ourselves. It is not from this earthly existence that we can expect the fulfilment of our hopes. While there is life there is hope. A life without hope is not worthy the name. But hope points beyond this life to a life to come. This earthly life, indeed, awakens hopes, but it by no means fulfils them; it gives promises, but it does not

keep them, it only deludes us with the expectations it holds out. How many disappointed hopes lie about the path of every human life! In youth, perhaps, the first soarings of the human mind promise a bold and distant flight; but how seldom do succeeding years fulfil the promise of youth! In youth, perhaps, such was the effervescence of the mind, that it seemed about to overflow on all sides. How narrow, how poor did it afterwards become! In early spring the trees are white with the snow of blossoms. A little while, and the blossoms are almost all underfoot, few setting into fruit; and of these still fewer coming to maturity. And as it is with the inner life of mental development, so is it in a far greater degree in the province of external events. It is full of disappointments. This is the complaint most frequently repeated, the true reason of the sadness which but too often increases with increasing years. For the ills which are the inevitable result of failing strength are but the lesser sorrows of age. Far bitterer are the disappointments, the misconceptions, the neglects, which age so often has to experience. How seldom is even the most prosperous life followed by a pleasant evening! And how difficult is it—how far more difficult than the young suppose—to grow old gracefully. (2)

It matters not whether we had a right to cherish the hopes with which we deceived ourselves or not, the complaint is still the same: life has not kept its promises. It may be that there are some few fortunate individuals to whom age fully yields what youth

desired; but if they were far more numerous, the unfortunate ones who see themselves deceived in their expectations would still form the majority. And is not an unhappy one worth as much as a happy one? And, after all, who is happy? <sup>(3)</sup>

There is an element of profound melancholy in human life. This melancholy is inseparable from it, inseparable from our feeling. <sup>(4)</sup> It is the frailty and transitoriness of all earthly things, it is the perception of the nothingness of all the possessions and enjoyments of this life, which diffuses this tone of mourning over our life. The king of Israel, who possessed wealth of intellect beyond all others, and all the enjoyments of life in a degree attained by few, sums up the result of his life in one word: 'All is vanity.' <sup>(5)</sup> And the Roman emperor who had commanded a world, exclaimed, when he came to die: 'I was everything, and have found that everything is nothing.'

And even if it were something—*one* moment extinguishes all. We die! Have we considered what this means? They, indeed, who know what it means cannot tell us, and we who speak of it do not yet know. We feel it, however, beforehand. We complain of life, yet flee from death. 'We live hating life, yet full of fear to die.' <sup>(6)</sup> And is this to be the end? Life is ever pointing us onward towards the future, each day towards the succeeding one; we are ever hoping from to-morrow what to-day and yesterday have failed to fulfil. However much may have

been granted us, there is always something left to desire, and that something ever appears the chief matter. Thus each day directs us to the next, until at last the day of death comes. And where, then, is the fulfilment of our hopes? If death is only death, life is a cruelty, and hope but irony. Life directs us to a life beyond death; for this earthly life does not satisfy the cravings of our spirits, and least of all the cravings of a Christian.

Hence arose the *belief in immortality*. It is as universal as the belief in God. It has prevailed among all nations of high mental attainments, while others have had at least some notion of it. (<sup>7</sup>) Everywhere death and the resting places of the dead are objects of awful reverence, and the laws which treat of duties to the dead have ever been among the most sacred. It was for the sake of fulfilling such duties that Antigone did not hesitate to risk her life by transgressing the law of the state. Duty to the dead was to her more sacred than obedience to the living. To defend the graves of ancestors was as pressing an interest as to defend hearths and altars. They seemed to be the tie which bound the people and their country together, and progenitors were ever regarded as those guardian spirits of their descendants, whom it was considered not merely a domestic, but a patriotic duty to honour by sacrifices. Art, too, has ever delighted to adorn, and thus to honour, the resting places of the departed; while it has been customary to erect them near the dwellings of the



living. An intercourse, moreover, has been instituted between the living and the dead through inscriptions, by which the latter have been made to address the former. The dead have never been looked upon as having ceased to exist, but as living in another world. If later times regarded this as a mere living in the memory of survivors, this was a declension from primitive opinion. The very custom of having the resting places of the dead in such near vicinity to the homes of the living, and thus keeping up, as it were, a tie of connection between them, is a memorial of the ancient belief, that the deceased were not the dead but the living. <sup>(8)</sup>

This belief is universal ; it was this belief which in Egypt built the pyramids, and to which the mummies bear testimony ; it was this which bestowed upon the Germanic nations the joyful courage with which they met death in the field of battle ; it was this which gathered the noblest of the Greeks about those secret doctrines of the Eleusinian mysteries, which sought to give them that consolation in death which their religion did not give. It is true that it was Christianity which first raised this belief to a certainty ; yet still it is as universal as belief in God, and is the inheritance of all mankind.

This universality proves it to be a *necessary* idea of the human mind ; necessary not only for the reason, but for the life. For there is no need of proof that a belief in immortality is one of the most essential supports of the whole moral constitution of social life. If

we remove this faith from the circle of human truths, we remove the moral idea from social life. We are told, indeed, that we must do good for the sake of goodness. But what is goodness? Is it not God? And if there is a God, is He not the Judge? We must all appear before His judgment seat. Our moral consciousness itself demands a final reckoning which none can escape, and in presence of which no deception can avail. And even without this,—it is of the highest practical importance that life should have a goal, for according to this will its whole tendency be determined.<sup>(9)</sup> But it has no goal unless there is an immortality, an immortality of the individual, and not merely of the species.

Proofs of the immortality of the soul have at all times been adduced.

The very existence of the idea of immortality is a proof of its truth. For experience shows us only death and transitoriness. Whence, then, do we get the notion of immortality with its universality and certainty? If our soul did not bear imperishable existence within it, it would not have the notion of imperishableness. We call ourselves mortals. Why? Why else than because we know ourselves to be immortal? This is the very reason that we are constantly reminding ourselves that we are mortal. Consciousness of our immortality is itself a proof of its truth. Special proofs have been adduced in justification of this direct consciousness.<sup>(10)</sup> These, like the proofs of the existence of God, are a testimony

that the consciousness exists. And it is in this testimony that their importance consists.

The soul's immortality has been proved from its nature. It is not material, not compound, like natural objects, and therefore not subject to dissolution. To acknowledge the truth of this proof is to say : Man is a personal being, and therefore created for God and for eternity.

It has been proved, too, from the destiny of man. Every one bears within him, in the gifts and powers of his mind, in his stock of knowledge, in his thirst after truth, in his efforts after moral excellence, more germs than ever come to maturity in this life. The truth of this is, that as long as we live we strive, and that our striving is after that which is infinite ; its goal lies beyond this life.

We all bear within us an ideal of perfection, for we bear within us an eternity. Hence, also, is it that we strive as those who strive after eternity. This it is which has given strength and impulse to the moral labours of all noble minded men, who have either striven after moral perfection or sacrificed themselves in the service of others.<sup>(1)</sup> In God, moreover, is eternity. We are immortal because we are for God, who is not the God of the dead but of the living. He it is that man's soul wants. We all carry about with us a home-sickness for our true home. This home-sickness wings the soul's flight. But here her pinions, which shall one day be free, are bound. 'Blessed are they which are home sick, for they shall reach their home.'

There was a time—it is not long ago—when the whole of religion was placed in the belief in immortality. This doctrine is, however, only a weak residue of the Christian doctrine of eternal life.

For the mere certainty of immortality neither helps nor comforts us. It involves quite as much of terror as of comfort ; and if we were to inquire in the world, I believe we should find just as many who would wish that all should be over with them with this life, as who comfort themselves with the hope of another life. The chief matter is the *sort* of existence we shall live.

There is no inquiry which awakens so much interest as that concerning the *state of the soul after death* ; and it is remarkable that there is scarcely any inquiry concerning which Holy Scripture makes so few disclosures. We cannot but conclude from this that our inquiries on this subject are for the most part unprofitable questions of curiosity, and not of religious exigency. For we are told plainly enough all that is necessary for us to know. The knowledge we have, however, is of an extremely serious nature.<sup>(12)</sup>

Death is a break in the history of our life. As long as we live in the body we pass imperceptibly from one stage of existence to another. Death separates by an abrupt break this life from the next. The dissolution of the tie which united body and soul severs also the thousand threads which bound us to the possessions and employments of this visible world. We are separated from the world and cast upon ourselves. This life belongs to work ; but the night

cometh when no man can work. This life calls us to things without ; that night of rest leads us within. This life belongs to the duties and things of this world ; after death we belong to ourselves alone, and our world is our inmost self and our reminiscences. Work is a benefit, but it is also a temptation. We flee from ourselves, not merely by surrendering ourselves to the distractions of pleasure, but by rushing into the turmoil of work. Death casts us back upon ourselves, and makes us tarry in our own presence. This world of the senses casts about our mind a motley veil in which we hide from ourselves. Death rends asunder this veil of the senses, and presents us unveiled to ourselves. Here the manifold voices of this world surge around us, and too often drown the voice of truth within us. Death leads us into the world of voiceless silence, into which none of the sounds of this earthly life can penetrate, and in which we can hear nothing but the voice of our own heart and the accusations of our own memory. And who will be able to endure this ? They only who, even while in the body, have lived a spiritual life ; who, in this deceptive world of sense, have submitted themselves to the jurisdiction of truth ; who, in this perishing world, have lived as natives of the eternal world.

Death leads us out of the world to God. We are then brought into His presence. Here, on earth, a thousand delusions interpose between us and God. There, we shall be placed in His immediate presence, as we are, not as we seem to be, not as perhaps we

mean to be, but as we really are. We may deceive men, we may delude ourselves ; but in God's presence every deception vanishes, and all self-delusion ceases. There is truth. Who will be able to bear the presence of God, the presence of inflexible truth ? Only they who have here become the friends of God. For the great distinction will be between those who have been His friends and those who have lived without Him. But this is decided in this life. 'It is appointed unto all men once to die, but after this the judgment' (Heb. ix. 27). That is to say : the decision takes place in this life. We are not to comfort ourselves with the hope of being able to retrieve there what we have neglected here. The very purpose for which this life in the flesh is bestowed upon us is, that our lot may be therein decided. The design of the manifold trials and duties of this life is, that through them and in them we may seek and find God. Though the moral consciousness of a man may seem to have been ever so slightly developed, though the life of an individual may have been passed in ever so dream-like a manner,—there is still that in the depths of every man's heart which is decisive. It is the fact, whether God has or has not been the portion of his soul, which will determine his eternal lot ; for he who has not found communion with God here, will not attain it there. 'No one becomes blessed (*selig*) by being buried.'\* And this blessedness it is which

\* *Selig*, saved or blessed, is the ordinary epithet by which the departed are mentioned, e.g., *Mein seliger Vater* = my late father. (Tr.).



is our chief concern ; not merely immortality, but a *blessed immortality !*

But the way to blessedness, to salvation, is Jesus Christ. He who has Him has eternal life ; and he who has not eternal life in this world will not find it in the next. The happiness of the life after death consists in communion with Jesus Christ. Death removes us indeed from the joys and possessions of the world, but it takes us also from its temptations, and delivers us from the sinful flesh. As long as we live here, it is our complaint that we never get rid of the body of sin, and are never so completely united to the Lord as the loving soul desires. The happiness that awaits us is to be at home with Him. This is a foreign land ; there is our home, for He is our home.

Such is the Christian's hope. But this blessedness has its stages of development. It passes through a history, and does not come to perfection till *the resurrection*. So long as soul and body are separated, their happiness is imperfect ; for we were created for a union of soul and body. The body is not the mere prison in which the soul is confined, nor the garment in which it is clothed, but its home and necessary instrument. All the internal and external activity of the spirit is carried on by means of the body. So long as it is deprived of this organ of its agency, it is relegated to a state of repose. But the spirit is destined and made for activity. Eternal life must be a life of activity, if it is to afford us the satisfaction which we seek. It must, therefore, be a life in the

body, if it is to be the perfection for which we are destined. In death we surrender our body, in the hope that we shall receive it again from death ; and that not to be again subject to death, but for ever rescued from death, and translated into a life of liberty ; no longer a constraint and obstruction to the spirit, but its fitting instrument ; a body which will be perfectly adapted to our use, fully fitted to our state of perfection ; a glorified and spirit-serving body.

It was a notion entirely new to the ancient world, that the body was destined for eternity ; but it was also a new notion that it was called to be a temple of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. vi. 19). They who see in the body merely the medium of sensuous perception, can indeed regard it only as the prey of corruption ; but they who know that it is called to sanctification, know, too, that it is destined for eternity.<sup>(13)</sup>

*How*, indeed, it is to be restored from death to a new life we are not able to say. We leave this to God. The apostle compares the body which we deliver to the earth to a seed (1 Cor. xv. 36, etc). The seed perishes, but from it is developed the germ of a higher life. That which our eyes perceive, and which we are capable of following, is indeed only the dissolution and transition of its component elements into other forms of life. How are we, from this dissolution of its elements, to receive again our body, which is no longer our own ? But is not our body even now undergoing a perpetual change of its elements, while yet it remains the same,—held together by the same idea,

which is the groundwork and controller of its form? And why should not this be the case when the soul again fashions to itself a new organism from the matter of the renewed world? It is with this prospect that the Christian creed concludes: 'I believe in the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.'

But this perfection of the individual depends upon the perfection of the Church, and of the world. For it is only in connection with the whole that individuals are perfected. We belong to the Christian Church, and we belong to the world, and our future is connected with the future of the world and of the Church.

What, then, is *the future of the Church*?

The word of prophecy in Holy Scripture contains copious disclosures on this subject. These, indeed, sound at first strange to us, and are opposed to our ordinary notions; but their truth will be justified to our deeper observation. <sup>(14)</sup>

We meet with two very plain predictions concerning the future of the Church in Holy Scripture. The one is, that the Gospel *is to be preached in all the world*, and that the fulness of the Gentiles, and afterwards the nation of Israel, are to enter into the Church. The other is, that a great *apostasy* will arise, out of which the last form of sin will be developed. When we bring before our minds the state of things in the time when these events were predicted,—when we consider how small was then the number of Christians, how insignificant their means, how oppressed their condi-

tion,—we cannot but say that the boldness of this glance into the future—a glance which not only beholds the era of universal propagation as already present, but even looks past it to a time of denial—is itself something astonishing ; and when we look around us, we are obliged to confess that both are on the road to their fulfilment.

For, first of all, it is unquestionable that Christianity will yet become *the universal religion*. However slowly the work of missions may advance, every heathen religion is pervaded by the feeling that its hours are numbered. <sup>(15)</sup> It is true that the fire of its ancient fanaticism still burns in Mahomedanism ; but its very irritation against everything Christian, shows that it thinks itself endangered by the Gospel. Certainly, it will not be everywhere a conviction of the truth of the Gospel which will procure it the victory. What missions will not do, the supremacy of European civilisation will effect. With this Christianity will enter into various lands as the religion of the dominant race ; and thus even secular interests will become, in God's hands, the means of gathering the nations into the Christian Church, so that the ends of the earth will be also the limits of the Church.

But the hope that even *Israel* will submit to the Crucified may seem to us the strangest of all ; and yet we must all confess that the very existence of this wondrous people shows that God has spared them for a future. If the future, then, belongs to Christ, so does Israel. There will be a conversion, not merely—

we are told in prophecy—of individuals, but of the whole nation. And the intimate connection still existing between the several portions of this nation, makes it evident that, when once a religious movement takes place among this people, it will easily become general. When this will happen, God only knows. As yet, their eyes are holden, and their senses blinded, so that they cannot recognise in Jesus, Him whom yet their prayers desire and their hopes expect. For though so many of this people are lost in the service of Mammon and the fleeting interests of the day, the hope of their fathers still survives in the nation's heart. When once the sore discipline under which God has kept them shall have worked its intended end, the scales will fall from their eyes, and they will know whom they crucified. And the longer they have despised Him who yet was the fulfilment of their hopes, the deeper will be their humiliation, and the more sincere their faith and love.

With this future of Israel will coincide, according to the word of prophecy, an era of indifference and *apostasy* among other nations; and no very great penetration is needed to see that such an era is already in preparation. For the state of affairs evidently points to an approaching spiritual separation. Times of indifference and enmity to Christianity have indeed often appeared before; but at no period has non-Christian opinion been so systematic, definite, and consistent. It has developed into a connected view of the universe, which is in conscious and definite

opposition to the Christian view. Religious custom was, in former times, a power which often kept contrasts back or at least cast a veil over them. Now, one religious custom after another is abandoned in the public life of civil society. This may be lamented, but it is an unceasing process, and the contrasted opinions are but brought out into bolder relief thereby. We are evidently approaching an age in which the hitherto Christian world will separate into two camps, the Christian and non-Christian. When this will happen, God alone knows. Delays may arise which may yet long postpone the event; but it is certain that the process of separation has begun.

But when the non-Christian camp shall have placed itself in determined opposition to the Christian, it is vain to hope that the spirit of toleration will permit each individual to live at peace in the possession of his own faith. Though the enmity of the great moral contrasts which form the motive powers of history seems to slumber, it is ever breaking forth anew. Nor must too much be hoped for from the natural goodness of the human heart. Scripture at least speaks of a time of persecution which will at last extend to all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. It may, perhaps, seem incredible to many of us that such a state of things should ever be possible. But should we have esteemed it possible that opposition to Jesus could have reached such a pitch of deadly hatred as it did in Israel? And did not the Christians of the first centuries in vain demand the



right of liberty of conscience? And who can affirm that hatred to Christianity has quite died out? <sup>(16)</sup>

Scripture describes this time of persecution as a time of sore temptation to all who believe in Christ. Not only power, but also public opinion and natural intellectual progress will be enlisted against the confession of Christ. It was this which formed so grievous a feature in the lot of the primitive Christians, that they found themselves not only exposed to martyrdom, but also excluded, or at least obliged to exclude themselves, from extensive departments of public life, and of general culture. To bear this needed more strength and assurance of faith than are generally found among us, whose cherished and legitimate ideal of life is the union of Christianity and culture.

Scripture places this development of the religious spirit in connection with the history of the nations. It holds out the prospect of a time of tremendous efforts at union on the part of the different nations, after their long period of separation. An era of great monarchies like those of the ancient world will return, and at last reach its goal in one great universal ruler, who will call the earth his kingdom. But his arrogance will be as great as his power, and, like the ancient Roman emperors, he, too, will lay claim to Divine honour. This will be the official religion of his kingdom, and all who refuse to conform thereto will be esteemed enemies of the State.

Such is the tenor of prophecy; and it adds, that

the persecution of believers will in the latter days have reached so intolerable a height, that a direct Divine interposition will take place. When things have gone to extremities, when the Church of Christ seems at the point of extinction, when all whose faith is but external or hesitating shall have separated from it for the sake of avoiding persecution, when the Church shall thus have been cleansed from all impure elements,—then will Christ, her Lord and King, appear, to the condemnation of all enmity against His name, and for the victory and recognition of His Church in the world. The path of the Church of Jesus Christ is like that of her Lord and Saviour: through the cross to the crown! Let her know it, let her comfort herself thereby; for the coming of Christ is the time of her perfection.

The word of prophecy describes, under many different images, the future triumph of the Church. It is scarcely possible here to distinguish between figure and reality, for the whole subject lies entirely beyond our present experiences. It is not this, however, which is of the first importance. Our chief concern is with the admonitions which it is the purpose of prophecy to give; for its design is not so much to unveil the details of future events as to be a word of exhortation and comfort: of exhortation to be faithful in suffering, even when the way seems to lead to the darkness of death; of comfort, by the assurance it gives of deliverance from tribulation, out of which the Church of Jesus Christ will be awakened to a new

and higher life, and to communion with her risen Lord. It is this which it is the chief design of prophecy to inculcate. <sup>(17)</sup>

But not only is the Church to be perfected, the *world* itself is to become God's perfect and eternal world; for history is neither a constant cycle of incessant repetitions, nor an endless and aimless progress. It could not be really history, nor could any development be effected therein, unless it were advancing towards an appointed goal. This development, however, is not merely that of the beneficial agencies which are powerfully working amidst the course of events; there is also a development of the power of sin, and of enmity against God, which no efforts of the good will ever be able to abolish or conquer. These two powers of history will be progressively brought into sharper distinction; the power of evil will be ever more and more decidedly opposed to the power of good and to the kingdom of God. Though frequently this power of evil may seem to be restrained or subdued, it is ever breaking forth afresh. Such a breaking forth of evil will, as Scripture teaches, bring about the world's final catastrophe at the last judgment, when God will for ever sever these moral contrasts.

It is said: the world's history is the world's judgment. And truly a Divine judgment is executed in history, for Divine justice presides over it. But this is the very reason that all the judgments of history are but a prophecy of God's final judgment. This

will be *the* universal judgment. History is a great drama. Every drama is a struggle between contrasts. Now every drama requires its denouement. Nor can the great drama of history be without its denouement.<sup>(18)</sup> Divine justice must have the last word. It has long suffered men, suffered sinners, to speak. But the last word will be its own; and this word must be a word of retribution, for it is the word of a Judge.

Scripture draws powerful and moving pictures of this last judgment, and tells how the mouth of the Judge will pronounce the sentence which will decide the eternal lot of each. 'Depart,' will He say to those who are lost; 'Come,' to those who are saved. He will pronounce the condemnation or salvation of all.

The thought of condemnation is an overwhelming one. It is true that He who occupies the judgment-seat is Infinite Love, but He is Holy Love. It is Jesus Christ, our Redeemer, who holds the final assize; but the Redeemer is also the Judge. He proclaimed this His future office while He was yet on earth. The fact that it is Jesus who will judge us, may assure us that Divine justice will not pronounce the final sentence until eternal pity is exhausted. But then even pity will give place to justice. It is difficult to us to conceive that God, who is infinite love, can eternally condemn. But when eternal mercy has exhausted itself upon a sinner, and all has been in vain,—what more can be done? Such is the greatness of human freedom, that it is capable of resisting even God. Such is our great, but also our sad

privilege, that our sinful hearts may be unconquerable even by God. The whole world, indeed, must bow before Omnipotence, but the heart of man takes upon itself not to bow to the mercy of the Almighty. With men a request is generally more powerful than a command; and he who will not yield to force will find himself powerless to resist a humble supplication. But what is human entreaty compared with the entreaty of the Almighty, or the silent power of human love compared with the supreme power of a crucified Saviour's eternal love? And yet the heart of man resists it! In this respect there are limits to the power of God, limits which He has Himself ordained. We need to wonder, not that God can condemn, but that man can so obstinately resist. Certainly, none will be lost who will let himself be saved, who offers even the slightest hold to Divine grace. But for him who wholly and finally closes his heart, who chooses to know nothing of God, who is in entire unison with all that is opposed to God,—the mouth of Divine justice has no other word than the complaint: 'And thou wouldest not.' As truly as God is the Holy One, and as truly as His holiness can have no fellowship with sin, so truly is he who has chosen sin for his portion excluded from God and from communion with Him, in other words—lost.

For this is perdition: to be far from God, and from communion with Him who alone can appease the ever gnawing hunger of the soul, who alone can allay the anxiety of the guilty conscience by the for-

givenness of sin,—to be separated from God, who alone is the source of life, and without whom all is vanity and emptiness, who alone is the light of our souls, and without whom all is darkness, who alone is our joy and consolation, and without whom existence is joyless and comfortless—to be separated from God and excluded from His world, to the unspotted purity of which sin and enmity against God can no longer have access; separated from those really good things of this world which are the joy of life, and from that communion with the good which is the great enjoyment of the soul,—separated from God and God's world, and cast upon oneself alone, in deep and perpetual solitude, in that dark and deadly silence, where the sinful soul has no society but the torture of memory and the night of despair,—to be thus alone, thus eternally alone, this is perdition. <sup>(19)</sup>

Even to conceive this, even to utter and hear of it, is almost more than we are able to bear. And yet these are but feeble words. What, then, will it be to be obliged to endure the reality? And yet even the lost will be constrained to acknowledge, and their very perdition will testify to, the holy justice of eternal love. It is this which reconciles the consciousness of the saved to the fact.

But how can I adequately speak of the salvation of the saved? Our thoughts are far too narrow to conceive this vast subject except in the imagery of a longing heart, and our speech far too poor to be able to clothe our longing in appropriate words. We



shall always speak of it with stammering speech until we proclaim in heaven, with new tongues, the unveiled mystery of infinite love.

‘And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes;’—it is thus that the holy prophet describes that eternal life of blessedness,—‘and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away’ (Rev. xxi. 4).

And what is even more, there shall be no more sin. This longing of all saints, this fervent desire of our best hours, this wish so repeatedly arising when we feel the degrading slavery of sin, when our weakness, it may be, succumbs to it, and bitter grief takes possession of our souls, and we sigh for deliverance,—this longing will then be fulfilled, and there shall be no more sin.

On the other hand, whatever that is great or noble may have dwelt in our souls—all the true ideals of our lives, which here have but hovered like thin shadows before our mind’s eye—will then be realised, and realised in *us*.

As long as we live, a contradiction runs through our whole being. We bear within us the original image of our ourselves, the Divine idea of our nature, but we are not its realisation. This forms our present unhappiness, that we are not in harmony with ourselves, that our knowledge and will, our will and power, our power and deed, are in contradiction to each other. But then our existence will be the har-

mony of our nature, for we shall be in harmony with God. This is our destiny which will then be fulfilled. This will be true life, a life of true freedom, a life of activity to all eternity.

And our harmony with ourselves will correspond with the harmony of the world. Now, discord is the law of existence, and strife the form of life ; then the world will be in happy unison with itself. No discord will any longer mingle in the hymns of the spheres. But this world was created for man. Now it obeys him only through constraint and violence, and avenges itself for such obedience by pain and suffering, by the destructive forces, and by becoming a medium of temptation and seduction. Then it will fulfil its destiny, being no longer against, but for him : and then will man's vocation in the world be fulfilled, made as he was, to be its prophet, priest, and king. It will be all light and clear to him then, and its silent speech will be perfectly intelligible to his spirit. In the characters of the glorified world he will read the great deeds of God. As we now read in Scripture the history of our redemption, so will God's perfected world be then the loud-voiced memorial, and the ever full and new Scripture of the great deeds of infinite love ; while, at the same time, it will be to us a place over which we shall hold happy sway, a sway which will be a priestly service to God, in a world which has become His temple. Thus will man's destiny in the world be fulfilled.

We shall be, moreover, in the society of the saved ;

for all the saints who have departed from this world since its commencement will be united into one great people of God. We shall see them—the magnates of God's kingdom, the sacred ideals of our minds, the beloved of our hearts. It will be an ever new meeting and recognition; and in their midst will be He who unites Godhead and manhood in one, who, by His obedience to death, even the death of the cross, saved the world of sinners, and made us the children of God. Then will His work be completed, His office fulfilled, and He will deliver the redeemed world into the hands of the Father, and God will be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28).

All that is transitory is but a parable: what it signifies finds its truth in God. Even the utmost that earth can offer is but a shadow; the reality of all is God. All the great thoughts which charm our minds are but refracted rays of that eternal light whose source is God. He is the whole vast truth. He is the goal, for He is the origin of our spirit. We shall have attained our goal, for we shall be with God.

And God will be all in all. He will be amidst all the thousand times ten thousand forms and shapes of the glorified world, and in all that we see we shall see Him. <sup>(20)</sup> Then shall we read the answer to all the questions of our mind, then shall all the enigmas of this existence be solved, and all the anomalies of this world abolished, in the perfected life of the world of glory, and in its Divine harmony.

This is the end, the goal of all things; this, too, is

our goal, the aim of our mind's inquiries, of our heart's desires.

Let us take a retrospect !

The contradictions of this existence are the goad which will not let us rest, which forces upon our mind questions to which this world furnishes no answer, and awakens in our heart aspirations which this world cannot satisfy. But the contradiction of all contradictions is sin, with its consequent guilt. This rends our nature to its inmost depths, and fixes between us and the eternal love of the holy God a chasm which no labour of our own is able to fill. Only eternal grace could bridge it over, that God in Christ might come to us, that we might come to Him. What the counsel of eternal love in the heart of God decreed for our deliverance, became a fact in Jesus Christ and His cross, and becomes our own experience by the work of God's Spirit in our hearts. From this hidden mystery of the inner man proceeds that renovation which has its kingdom below in the hearts of God's children, and its ultimate aim in the perfected life of God's eternal kingdom, when both body and soul will rejoice in the living God.

Such is the doctrine of Christianity, which I have brought before you in these Lectures. It does not consist in certain precepts and views, but is glad tidings, the announcement of a great history, embracing both heaven and earth, whose origin is in God's eternal counsels, whose end is in the eternal world of glory, whose centre is Jesus Christ, the crucified and

risen Saviour. In Him, the Son of God, did eternal grace enter into time ; in us, the children of God, does it begin that eternal work whose perfection we hope for.

‘ Now are we the sons of God ; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be : but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him ; for we shall see Him as He is ’ (1 John iii. 2). This is the consummation, and with this glance at the future I conclude these lectures. No one can feel more strongly than myself how inadequately my words correspond with the magnitude of the subject they treat on ; but He who did not despise the gifts of the woman ‘ which was a sinner,’ when she offered her tears and her ointment, will not disdain even this small gift which is laid at His feet. May He accept, bless, and use it according to His good pleasure !





## NOTES.

---

### NOTES TO LECTURE I.

(<sup>1</sup>) A treatise, which has since become famous, was published by Ullmann in the year 1845, entitled, *Das Wesen des Christenthums* (5th edit., 1865). In this, Christianity, as is indeed usual in the treatment and exhibition of this subject, is pointed out as the absolute religion, with respect both to Judaism and Heathenism ; while, in agreement with Schleiermacher, and in opposition to Rationalism, stress is laid upon the central importance of the person of Jesus Christ as the necessary Mediator of our communion with God. 'Christianity is the religion which, in the person of its founder, actually realises that union of man with God which every other religion has striven after, but none attained ; and which from this creative centre, by doctrine and moral influence, by redemption and reconciliation, restores the individual and the human race to their true destiny, to that true communion, to that union with God in which all that is human is sanctified and glorified.' (p. 68, 1845). Compare also Martensen's 'Christian Dogmatics,' p. 17.\* "The nature of Christianity does not differ from that of Christ himself. The founder of the religion is Himself the matter of the religion. He is not merely the historical founder of a religion, one whose person may be separated from the doctrines He proclaimed ; the person of Jesus Christ, on the contrary, has a constant, an ever present importance to the human race. As the Mediator and Atoner, the holy point of union between God and the sinful world, He is also continually the Redeemer of the sinful race of man," etc.

\* Translated in Clark's Foreign Theological Library. 1866.

(<sup>2</sup>) Similarly does Martensen (*Dogm.*, p. 15, etc.) represent the relation of the religions. 'The deepest conceivable contrast between the natures of God and man, is the contrast between Creator and creature, between the Holy God and sinful man. If we consider the different religions, with respect to this fundamental problem, we may say that heathenism knows not the problem; that Israel is living in the problem and awaiting its solution, but that Christianity alone furnishes the true solution,'—'through its Gospel, of the Incarnation of God.' It is also the fundamental idea of the introduction to Dorner's 'History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ,'\* that 'the more complete our survey of the whole province of præ-Christian religion, the more evident will become, on one side, the historical necessity of Christianity, and the preparation for it in other religions; and on the other, its novelty and originality;' and that the whole course of religious history before Christ teaches 'how the præ-Christian world was struggling towards Christianity, how the common enigma of all præ-Christian religion is solved thereby, and how its fundamental idea furnishes the key by which all these religions may be better understood than they understood themselves' (p. 3, etc.) 'Thus the whole history of religion prior to Christianity becomes, in the grandest sense, a *preparatio evangelica*, and bears testimony that Christianity expresses what all religions seek, but no less does it prove that the idea of the God-man, which is so especially characteristic of Christianity, must have arisen within and not without Christianity. This idea is original in and essential to Christianity. The fact first took place, and the fact gave the knowledge' (vol. i., p. 45). I have in the text omitted Mahommedanism, because it forms no independent stage in the history of religious development, but a retrogression to the surpassed stand-point of a stiff monotheism which knows no future, and is therefore no power capable of advancing and elevating the human intellect to a higher platform. 'It has often been remarked that

\* Translated in Clark's Foreign Theological Library. 5 vols.

Islamism occupies the position of an anachronism in the history of religions ; a religion declaring certain external usages thoroughly essential, and knowing nothing of the great principle of love, etc., appearing subsequently to Christianity, and aspiring to become the universal religion.' 'To reconcile Islamism with humanity is, in my opinion, impossible' (Nöldeke, in *Herzog's Theol. Realencycl.*, xviii., 815, 816).

(<sup>3</sup>) On *Heathenism*, compare the passage in 'Lectures on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity,' Lect. VIII. (Clark's Translation, p. 212, etc.) ; also, Stirm, *Apologie* (Letter X., pp. 355-392) ; Wuttke, *Geschichte des Heidenthums*, 1852 ; Tholuck, *Der Sittliche Charakter des Heidenthums nach der heil. Schrift.* (3d edit.), 1867 ; and *Vortrag über das Heidenth. nach der heil. Schrift.*, 1853. Dilmann, too, in his *Rede über den Ursprung der alttest. Religion*, 1853, has some excellent remarks on the naturalism of the heathen religions (p. 7). 'The essential principle of the heathen idea of God does not consist, first and chiefly in a plurality of gods, but in that resolving of the deity into nature, of which polytheism is but a consequence. The heathen religions are, one and all, the religions of nature ; their principle is the deification of nature ; their gods are originally nothing but the powers of nature,' etc. Compare also Rom. i. 23-25. *Nägelsbach*, in his well known work on the Homeric and post-Homeric theology, gives some very forcible and valuable proofs of the seeking character of the religious and moral views of the old Grecian world.

(<sup>4</sup>) I have, in my 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lect. VI., p. 142, etc., and Lect. III., p. 41 (with which compare the present remarks), brought forward what was needful on the primitiveness and universality of religion. This thought is well carried out by Naville in *Der Himm-lische Vater*, seven discourses, trans., Leipzig, Hässel, 1865, p. 11, etc.: 'The idea of the one God is primitive and fundamental ; Polytheism is but derived. A forgotten monotheism slumbers under the multiform worship. It is

the secret stock from which the latter grew; but the exuberant offshoots consumed the whole strength of the parent tree' (p. 17).

(<sup>5</sup>) Compare the beautiful and well known line of Homer's, *Odyssey*, iii. 48 : πάντες δὲ θεῶν χατέους' ἀνδρῶποι ('All men need the gods').

(<sup>6</sup>) Some of the finest effusions of the religious spirit both of the Eastern and Western worlds, which may not, perhaps, be familiar to all readers, may serve to corroborate what is here expressed. A hymn to Zeus, by the ancient stoic Cleanthes (260 B.C.), has been preserved, in which the philosopher soars above the limits of the popular religion of Greece, and praises in Zeus the universal spirit of the world, though not, indeed, without pantheistic notions :—

'Supreme immortal god, many-named eternal governor, ruling in nature, thou that guidest the universe according to laws, Hail ! It is granted to every human being to speak with thee, for we are of thy race. One key-note was given to the voices of each of the beings who live and who work upon earth. With this will I praise thee and ever exalt thy authority. Each of the worlds, revolving on high about the earth, follows where thou leadest, and willingly bows to thy command. Without thee, O mighty one, no one thing exists, either on earth or in the divine heights of ærial space, or in the sea, except what the wicked effect in their own mental blindness. But thou knowest how to turn evil into good. Thou canst make deformity beauty. Thou dost impart pleasantness to what is unpleasant. Therefore didst thou dispose all things to one end, evil to good, that there might be for ever one single all-prevailing word to all, from which only the wicked among mortals seek to escape. Madmen ! who, ever striving after the attainment of good, never perceive that common decree of god, never understand that, which by wisely obeying they might enjoy a happy life ; but they rush past the beautiful, after this and that. One covets in his heart honour and fame ; another lays prudent plans,

and stirs up strifes ; others seek after pleasures and bodily enjoyments, hurrying forward with all their might, labouring to attain the attractive end ; but, O god, the giver of all, the cloud-covered, the ruler of the lightning, O father, deliver mankind from the mad folly, strip it from their mind, and let them find that rule of conduct to which thou dost conform, who rulest all according to eternal justice, that we, honoured by thee, may render honour to thee, ever praising thy deeds in song, as becomes the mortal born ; for there is no higher dignity bestowed, whether on gods or men, than to praise in righteousness the decree common to all' (*From Knapp's 'Christoterpe,' 1844, p. 80*).

Beside this production of the Western mind may be placed some lines from a mystic poem (*Parabara-Kanni*) of the Tamul poet Tājumānaver. Siva is celebrated 'as the Supreme Being, and the union of the soul with him spoken of in a manner recalling the Christian mysticism of an Angelus Silesius (Grant, *Indische Sinnpflanzen*, Erlangen, 1865, p. 187, etc.):—

'Thou standest on the summit of the universe. Thou dost pervade and direct earth and all things, Supreme Being !

'Is no way open for the pious to approach thee, who come weeping and consumed with love ? Supreme One !

'He who would look at the sky ascends the hill ; the pinions of self-contemplation bear men towards thee, Supreme One !

'To deeply contemplative minds thou dost show heavenly things as in a mirror, thou ærial mountain of delight, thou Supreme One !

'He who loves thee enough, just dies, and then sleeps in a cradle of delight, thou Supreme One !

'O thou the beloved, the dearly treasured of souls, who look upon potsherds and jewels as one, Supreme One !

'If I feel joyful and free, am I not still wandering in the wilderness ? Thy servant is driven in the desert like a straw carried about by a whirlwind, O Supreme One !

'And yet I care not for the powers of the world, if they do not fold their hands before thee, Supreme One !



‘The kine have pity on their young. Merciful mother, bestow favour upon me, thy poor worshipper, whatever evil I may be guilty of. Thou hast a maternal nature, art gentle and patient, thou Supreme One!’

(<sup>7</sup>) On the continuance of human sacrifices, even among the Greeks, down to the time of Pausanias, compare Nägelsbach,—*Nachhomer. Theolog.*, p. 196,—in which reference is also made to the researches of Friedr. Hermann, Gerhard, etc.

(<sup>8</sup>) We need only refer to the touching fifty-first Psalm, which traces sin to its first beginnings in the individual life, to birth and conception, and that not for the purpose of excusing it, but to point out the sinful corruption of man as a radical one.

(<sup>9</sup>) So Schelling, in his ‘Lectures on the Method of Academical Study’ (1802), Lecture IX. (3d edit., 1830, p. 192): ‘Of the idea of the Trinity, it is clear that, unless speculatively understood, it is, in general, devoid of meaning. Theologians explain the incarnation of God in Christ just as empirically, for they assert that God at a definite moment of time assumed human nature, which is absolutely inconceivable, since God is eternal, beyond all time: therefore the incarnation of God is an eternal incarnation.’ And with respect to Hegel, Strauss (*Glaubenslehre*, ii., 214, etc.), has clearly decided the question concerning his particular opinions. Strauss is only carrying out this philosophy to its legitimate consequences when he here reiterates and sums up the fundamental notions of the concluding discussion of his *Leben Jesu*: ‘If reality is ascribed to the idea of the unity of the Divine and human natures, is this equivalent to the admission that this unity must once have been actually manifested, as never before nor since, in an individual? This is not the manner in which the ideal is realised; it is not wont to lavish all its fulness in one specimen, and be niggardly towards all others—to express itself perfectly in that one



instance, and imperfectly in all remaining instances ; it delights rather in pouring out its abundance among a multiplicity of specimens mutually completing each other, in an alternation of now appearing and now again disappearing individuals.' In saying this, the human race is brought forward as the God-man, and the key of all Christology is declared to be, that instead of an individual, an idea, in the sense of a real conception of a species, is set forth as the subject of the attributes which are predicated of Christ by the Church (*Leben Jesu*, Eng. trans., vol. ii., 3d edit. p. 767).

(<sup>10</sup>) It is one merit of Strauss's *Glaubenslehre* to have destroyed this illusion. In the introduction to this work especially, he expresses himself in a very drastic manner on the subject.

(<sup>11</sup>) So e.g., Schweizer (of Zürich), a chief advocate of this tendency, in his *Christlichen Glaubenslehre*, i., 1863, p. 117, in which it is pointed out, as an advance made by Schleiermacher, that in the midst of all his existing imperfections, 'he has at least asserted that principle upon which so much depends—the substitution of the idea of moral and religious perfection for the second person of the Trinity.' So also (p. 121) he speaks of the idea of absolute piety and happiness ever reviving within us with increasing purity. On the other hand, the necessity of facts as the foundation of faith is ably and emphatically maintained by Stutz, a non-theologian, in his excellent lectures, *Die Thatsachen des Glaubens*, which he delivered in Zürich against the modern tendency so fashionable there (p. 28). For, as Luther says, 'we have not a pictured sin, and therefore not a pictured Redeemer.' This indifference to facts, which are thus surrendered to criticism, is the distinctive feature of modern so-called liberal theology in France also ; see, e.g., Coquerel fils, *Des premières transformations historiques du Christianisme* (Paris, 1866, p. 49, etc.): 'The deity, miracles, and resurrection of Christ, are, both as concerns His whole work and our inner life, utterly without significance.' Compare *N. Evang. Kirchengz.*, 1866, No. 15, p. 229.

(<sup>12</sup>) Schelling has some able remarks on this subject (in his *Philosophie der Offenbarung*, *Sämmtl. WW.* ii., Lecture X., 3, p. 195 :) ‘How frequently has not the historical character of Christianity been declared to be heathenish (not its external but its higher facts, *e.g.*, the præ-existence, the præ-mundane being of Christ, His position as Son of God), and, therefore, no longer compatible with modern thought? *The very essence of Christianity is, however, its historical character*, not the ordinary part of its history, as, *e.g.*, that its founder was born under Augustus, and died under Tiberius, but that higher history upon which it properly rests, and which is its proper matter. I call it a higher history, for the true subject-matter of Christianity is a history in which deity is implicated—a divine history. That would be but a poor explanation, and entirely destructive of the peculiarity of Christianity, which should distinguish between the *doctrinal* and the historical, and consider the *former* the essential and special matter, and the latter its mere form or clothing. The history is not merely incidental to the doctrine, it is the doctrine itself. The doctrinal matter, which might perhaps remain after the excision of the historical, as, *e.g.*, the general doctrine of a personal God, such as even rational theology sometimes admits, or the morality of Christianity, would be nothing peculiar, nothing distinctive: the history, on the contrary, is just that which is the distinctive feature of Christianity, which needs explanation. . . . It is incongruous to speak only of the teaching of Christ. The chief matter of Christianity is Christ Himself, not what He said, but what He is, what He did. Christianity directly considered is not a *body of doctrine*, it is a thing, an object; doctrine is but the expression of the *thing*.’ Under this aspect even the influence of Schleiermacher, to whom will ever belong the merit of replacing the person of Jesus Christ in its central position, in opposition to rationalism, which reduces the whole of Christianity to His teaching, has been important. For though his Christ is not in the full sense the Christ of the Church, yet it is the actual person Jesus Christ upon whom he founds the new life of individuals in all ages, and by whom he admits this life to have been—

though but indirectly—effected. Schleiermacher, at all events, insists upon the intrinsic certainty of the fundamental fact, namely, ‘the ideal perfection’ of the historical Christ. And this is something quite different from that modern tendency of so-called liberal theology, which, after all, really sees nothing more in Christianity than a certain general religious feeling, or the mere force of civilisation.

(<sup>13</sup>) This is confessed even by Edmond Scherer, an advocate of the illuminism movement in France. (*Essai : la crise du Protestantisme*, in his *Mélanges d'Histoire Religieuse*, 1866, p. 240) ; ‘*La religion naturelle n'existe que dans les livres. Les religions qui vivent et qui agissent sont de religions positives*, etc. *Nägelsbach Nachhomer. Theol.*, p. 476 : ‘Every religion is founded on facts ; false religions upon supposed, true religions upon actual facts.’

(<sup>14</sup>) So thought Fichte. *Anweisung zum seligen Leben* (1806, WW., vol. v., 1845, p. 485) : ‘It is only metaphysical, and by no means historical truth, which makes a man happy ; the latter only makes him wise. If any one is really united with God, and is in God, it is a matter of indifference to him by what means he attained this ; and it would be a very useless and perverse employment to be ever recalling to mind the means, instead of living in the thing itself. If Jesus could return into the world, it might be expected that He would be perfectly contented to find Christianity really ruling in the minds of men, whether His merit in the matter were acknowledged or slighted ; and this is in fact the very least that could be expected from such a man, who even while He lived sought not His own honour, but the honour of Him who sent Him.’ The manner in which the position occupied by Christ with respect to Christianity is here viewed as a merely external one, needs no remark. Schleiermacher, in his earlier period, expresses himself in a nearly similar manner (*Reden über die Religion*, Rede 5, WW. i., 1, 1843, p. 432), in words which he subsequently thought fit to correct in the notes. O. Bagge also strangely concludes his strange book, *Das Prinzip des Mythos im Dienst der*

*christl. Position*, 1865 (p. 418), with this notion: What Schleiermacher once, in a sermon (iii. 10; compare Strauss, *Der Christus des Glaubens*, etc., (p. 217), designated a fable,—viz., that His (Christ's) hour, to be forgotten, must also come; that if it were His serious purpose to make the world entirely free, it must also have been His will to make it free from Himself, that God might be all in all,—must be looked upon as the end of the dealings of God.' It is not blasphemy to say that Christ, who founded the Church and made Himself its Lord, will, the sooner the better, be dispensed with, etc. But how little ground there is for all this, Christ's two institutions, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, suffice to prove.

(<sup>15</sup>) This conception of the nature of Christianity is also the central thought of Pascal's *Apologie*. Compare ii. 136 (v. Faugère's edition). *Caractères de la vraie Religion*, ii. 141, p. 145: '*L'incarnation montre à l'homme la grandeur de sa misère par la grandeur du remède qu'il a fallu.*'

(<sup>16</sup>) This thought, viz., that the Christian faith is certainty, and does not deal merely in opinions and probabilities, is very forcibly stated by Luther at the beginning of a treatise on necessity of the year 1525 (*de servo arbitrio*) against Erasmus: for here, says he, we are concerned about truths which are certain, because of the Word of God; hence Christian faith has nothing to do with scepticism, &c., but stands or falls with certainty. Compare *e.g.*, Luther's W.W., by Walch, xxiii. 2058, sq.: A Christian must be quite certain about his doctrine and matter, and therefore know how to give a reason for his doctrine, or he is no Christian at all. Away therefore with philosophers; they are all like the sceptics or Academics, who have never wished to assert anything positively. We Christians must be supremely certain of our doctrine, and know how, without the slightest hesitation, to say either yes or no, and to stick to it, &c.

(<sup>17</sup>) Compare on this subject, Pasc. *Pens.* ii. 108: '*Nous connaissons la vérité non seulement par la raison, mais encore*

par le cœur : c'est de cette dernière sorte que nous connaissons les premiers principes, et c'est en vain que le raisonnement qui n'y a point de part, essaye de les combattre.' P. 109 : 'Et c'est pourquoi que ceux à qui Dieu a donné la religion par sentiment du cœur sont bien heureux et bien légitimement persuadés. Mais ceux qui ne l'ont pas, nous ne pouvons la donner que par raisonnement en attendant que Dieu la leur donne par sentiment de cœur, sans quoi la foi n'est qu'humaine et inutile pour le salut.' Delitzsch (*System der christl. Apologetik*, 1869, p. 493,) quotes the saying of St Bernard : *Sermo amantis barbarus est non amanti* (the language of the lover is an unknown tongue to one who does not love). And the Eastern proverb : A fool knows not how a wise man feels, for he never was wise ; but a wise man knows how a fool feels, for he too was once a fool. So also is it with the unregenerate with respect to the regenerate.

(<sup>18</sup>) In opposition to the (impossible and unattainable) requirement of freedom from all assumptions, as insisted on by Strauss, in his so-called Christian *Glaubenslehre*, for the purpose of showing the stand-point of faith to be unscientific. Stahl, in the Preface, p. vii., to his *Fundamenten einer christl. Philos.*, 1846, reminds of the fact that every philosophical system, when traced to its first principles, is based upon faith, and that even unbelief is a kind of faith. Hase, too, in his *Gnosis*, vol. i., 2nd edition, 1869, p. 14, says : 'All our scientific inquiries rest upon the belief that there is reason in the course of things,' &c. The thought that every grade of existence must be measured by its proper standard is ably carried out in Grau's 'Lecture on Faith as the Highest Reason' (*Gütersloh*, 1865, p. 4, &c.). We are here also reminded (p. 20), of the application which Schelling (*Philos. der Offenb.*, 24 Lect., WW. ii. 4, p. 27) makes of the well known saying of Alexander the Great to Parmenio, with respect to this thought, that the lower cannot be a standard for the higher. 'When, after repeated overthrows, Darius offered peace to Alexander, on the advantageous condition of resigning to him a consider-



able portion of his kingdom, and giving him his daughter in marriage, &c., Parmenio thought, if he had been Alexander, he would have accepted these conditions. Alexander answered : '*Et ego, si Parmenio essem.*' Alexander's manner of acting surpassed the notions of Parmenio, his most intimate friend. But God is raised infinitely higher above men than one man can, by the magnitude of his designs, be raised above another. In *this* sense alone, then, do the dealings of God in revelation surpass all human conception. It is not that we are utterly incapable of comprehending them, but that, in order to do so, we must measure them by a standard which *surpasses all ordinary human standards.*'

---

## NOTES TO LECTURE II.

(1) Compare Pascal, *Pensées*, ii. 10 : '*La foi Chrétienne ne va principalement qu' à établir ces deux choses : la corruption de la nature et la rédemption de Jésus Christ.*' Pascal frequently recurs to this thought. Compare ii. 136, &c. It forms the central point of his whole Apology, and is in his eyes the special justification of Christianity. So also in the *Charactères de la vraie Religion*, ii. 141. Compare Lecture I., Note 15. These two truths form the foundation upon which the whole body of evangelical divinity rests, and upon which the first Protestant treatise on divinity, in particular (*Melanchthon's loci*), is founded.

(2) Compare, on this subject, Röper (Professor of Natural History and Botany at Rostock), *Der Friede in der Schöpfung kein Friede in Christo*, a lecture in the *Ev Kirchenzeitung*, 1864, No. 30. I here give an abstract of the principal contents of this interesting lecture. The author begins by saying 'that poets, &c., direct the human heart, in its search after peace, to Nature and its peace. Is peace, then, to be found in the vegetable and animal kingdoms ? A brilliant picture is then drawn of the virgin beauty and



exuberant luxuriance of uncultivated nature in the primeval forests of Brazil. But the obverse of this picture is to be found in the violent storms, the hurricanes, and the terrible devastation they cause ; in the destructive labours of animals, apes, birds, and insects ; in the manner in which the largest trees, gnawed by ants, termites, and other insects, suddenly break down, and the royal palms are destroyed by the wretched palm-worm, while whole plantations are eaten up by ants, and the largest tracks laid bare by locusts (whose hosts are estimated by billions), and made so utterly barren that nothing grows on these desolate places for many years. And not only animals, but plants, carry on, as it were, a war against plants, and against their own posterity. And chiefly the parasitical plants. The notorious liana, a plant like our ivy, crushes the tops of the proudest trees ; others absorb the bark, or consume the vital juices after the manner of fungi. The magnificent clusia, which grow upon the trees themselves, conceal them like coffins. And what an infinite number of germs perish ! In every acorn, besides the one seed which is developed, are five germs, which are either crushed to death or drained of their moisture. In every cocoa-nut are at least three germs, one of which kills the other two by consuming all the nourishing milk, &c. In short, every plant lives by plundering others, and destroys other formations to deprive them of the matter necessary to itself. A continual process of destruction and transmutation is going on in every little cell ; new cells being formed only by the destruction of old ones, &c. And then, finally, the animal kingdom ! Most beasts live upon animal, some upon living food. Those who serve as food to others are often slowly tortured to death. The pretty, and, in some varieties, tuneful nine-murders, impale their prey—butterflies and other insects—upon thorns and prickles, where they may live for days. And then the great massacres of the little ants, who make regular war on each other, unmercifully slaying their grown-up adversaries, and bringing up the kidnapped larvæ as slaves ! The ichneumon fly lays its eggs in caterpillars, &c., and the larvæ then consume the body of their host. The wall-wasp brings each of its young maggots

from ten to twelve little caterpillars, wounded, but not dead, who live from ten to twelve days, and of which one is devoured each day, till the maggots enter the chrysalis state within fourteen days. Add to these the horseflies, autumn flies, and gadflies in the lowlands of the Danube—those torturers and slayers of cattle, &c. And in the primeval forests—what enemies of man! Then, too, the lower organisms! The lower its grade of organisation, the more is a creature infested by parasites. Many thousands of askarides live in the entrails of the little land-tortoise, and in the body of a living ear-wig, a thread-worm was found curled up, whose length, when unrolled, was three inches. “We may boldly assert that the condition of other organised creatures entirely corresponds to that of man, and is therefore by no means a peaceful one.” Nor is it otherwise in inanimate nature. Here, too, a continual work of destruction, by physical and chemical agents, is going on. To mention only tempests and earthquakes! And are we not living upon a sea of fire? But the starry heavens? The so-called peaceful moon is as arid as pumice-stone, scarcely surrounded by an atmosphere, barren and desolate as the scene of a conflagration. Jupiter’s sea of clouds is agitated by the most fearful storms, &c. In short, here, too, there is no stability. All is groaning for redemption. Nature ‘preaches the most crushing fatalism, the most inexorable necessity and predestination.’ In God alone is peace.

From this point of view we can easily understand how Perthes could write to Steffens (*P. Leben*, edit. 4, iii., 199). ‘Much has been done since Goethe to reveal the depths and shallows of the human heart; but no one has yet attempted to bring before the mind of the present age a lively picture of the horrors of nature and the cruelty of her operations, and to show that they who would infer the existence of a God, from the goodness and wisdom therein displayed, necessarily fail unless they are satisfied with mere rhetoric. You must write a thoroughly ungodly book for deists and rationalists, one which would be a horror and an abomination to both. A great blessing might rest on such a book: it might give to many that only true key to the

knowledge of nature which is involved in the apostle's words (Rom. viii. 22), that nature, severed from God through man and with man, is in a state of disorder, and groaneth and travaileth in pain, together with us, until now.' Similarly, too, Auerbach, *Auf die Höhe*, edit. 3, 234 (*Irma's Tagebuch*). 'Nature is terrible, she labours so long at the production of a being, and then suddenly and wantonly lets it perish.' God is a God who hideth Himself. Compare 'Apol. Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lect. I., Note 9, Pascal ii., 113. The existence of God cannot be proved to unbelievers from nature. *Ce n'est pas de cette sorte que l'écriture, qui connaît mieux les choses qui sont de Dieu, en parle. Elle dit au contraire que Dieu est un Dieu caché, et que depuis la corruption de la nature, il les a laissées (les hommes) dans un aveuglement dont ils ne peuvent sortir que par Jesus-Christ.* The whole section treats of these thoughts, p. 118. *Je regarde de tous parts et ne vois partout qu'obscurité. La nature ne m'offre rien qui ne soit matière de doute et d'inquiétude.* Delitzsch in his above quoted work recalls the saying of Schopenhauer: 'If God made this world, I should not like to be God; its woes would break my heart.'

(<sup>3</sup>) Victor Kip (*Der Pessimismus und die Ethik Schopenhauers*, Berlin, 1866) gives a sketch of the history of the pessimist view of the world, in order to represent Schopenhauer as its chief advocate. Even in the Vedas, especially the Upanishaden, i.e., the extracts from the Brahmanas, which form the second part of each Veda, are found the fundamental features of pessimism. The soul unborn and infinite as Brahma, nay, a part of himself, gets into darkness in a corporeal covering, and suffers torment, from which not even death releases it, for it wanders from body to body, and dies successive deaths after continually renewed torments. Deliverance from this suffering is only possible through the pantheistic view of the union of Brahma with all that has emanated from him. By this means man passes out of the world of the phenomenal and enters into the Nirvana, i.e., into a state of happiness ('Schopenhauer's Negation of the Will'). The Zend religion sought to solve

the contradiction by dualism, *i.e.*, the twofold origin of good and evil. Heraclitus had already viewed the birth of man as something calamitous, a birth only for death. The descent of the reasoning power from the flaming heavens to earth was the death of Divine life, and the animation of mankind, who now, in circumscribed action, suffer want upon earth. The subsequent philosophy of the Greeks was optimism ; of the Orientals, pessimism ; and so was also the prevailing philosophy of the Christian era. It was not till his later period that Fichte struck a pessimist chord ; but it is Schopenhauer who has fully carried out pessimist views. Some passages from his principal work (*Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*) may serve to prove this. He designates his subject to be (§ 56, 3d edit., p. 366), that *all life is essentially suffering*. He then proceeds thus to describe (§ 57, p. 367) the life of man : ‘His proper existence is only in the present, the unchecked flight of which into the past is a constant transition to death, a continual dying.—The present, however, is continually becoming the past ; the future is quite uncertain, and always short. Hence, his existence, even when viewed only in its formal aspect, is a continual rushing of the present into the dead past, a continual dying. But when we look at it in its physical aspect also, it is manifest that, as our walk is confessedly a continually checked fall, so our bodily life is but a continually checked dying, a still delayed death ; and so, too, finally, is the activity of our mind an ever postponed tediousness. Every breath we draw repulses the death which is ever pressing towards us, and which we are thus fighting against every hour. At last death must conquer, for we are devoted to it by the very fact of our birth ; and it is only playing awhile with its prey before it devours it.’ Sec. 59, p. 382 : ‘The history of every life is a history of suffering, for the course of life is generally but a series of greater or less misfortunes.—The real matter of the world-famed monologue in Hamlet may be thus summed up : Our condition is so wretched that utter annihilation would be decidedly preferable.—So, too, what the father of history adduces (Herodotus, vii. 46), viz., that there never existed

a man who did not more than once wish not to outlive the following day, has never yet been refuted. Hence, the so frequently lamented shortness of life may perhaps be its best attribute.—If, finally, all the terrible pains and sorrows to which his life is ever exposed could be brought before the eyes of each, he would be seized with horror; and if the most obstinate of optimists were led through the hospitals, lazarettos, and surgical operation rooms; through the prisons, torture-chambers, and slaveholds; over the fields of battle and places of execution; if, then, those dark abodes of misery, where it creeps out of the view of cold curiosity, were opened to him; and, finally, a sight were afforded him of the starvation of some Ugolino—he would surely at last perceive what kind of *meilleur des mondes possibles* this is.

. . . . Besides, I cannot here refrain from the declaration that *optimism*, where it is not the mere thoughtless speech of those under whose low foreheads nothing but words are lodged, seems to me not only an absurd, but a truly *wicked* mode of thought, a bitter contempt for the numberless sorrows of mankind. Let it not for a moment be thought that Christian doctrine is favourable to optimism, for in the Gospels, on the contrary, the terms world and evil are nearly synonymous expressions.—Schopenhauer subsequently (ii. 46, p. 654) gives a touching and partially true description ‘of the vanity and sufferings of life.’ I extract a passage from this section. ‘Life may be represented as a constant deception, both in small and great things. If it makes promises, it never keeps them, unless to show how undesirable is that which was desired. Thus first hope, then the thing hoped for, disappoints us. If it gives, it is but to take away. The charm of distance shows us a paradise, which vanishes like an optic delusion if we suffer ourselves to approach it. Hence happiness ever lies in the future or the past; and the present may be compared to a dark cloud, which the wind drives before it across a sunny plain; behind it there is brightness, but it is itself ever casting a shadow. It is, consequently, ever unsatisfying, the future being uncertain, the past irrecoverable. Life, with its hourly, daily, weekly, and yearly, little, greater,



and great disagreeables, with its disappointed hopes, and its mishaps baffling all calculations, bears so plainly the impression of something which is to be spoilt to us, that it is difficult to conceive how this could ever have been mistaken, and how any one could have persuaded himself that it was given to be thankfully enjoyed, and that man was made to be happy. Far rather does the continual disappointment of hope, the disabusing of expectation, the general constitution of life, show that it is intended and calculated to produce the conviction that nothing is worth our efforts, our energies, and our struggles—that all possessions are but vanity, that the world is bankrupt in all quarters, and life a business which does not pay its expenses.' Hence, satisfaction and prosperity are merely negative, are but the absence of suffering. 'We feel pain, but not painlessness; we feel care, but not its absence; fear, but not security. We feel a wish as we feel hunger and thirst; but, as soon as it is gratified, it fares as the morsel we enjoy, which, the moment it is swallowed, ceases to exist to our perception. We painfully feel the want of enjoyments and pleasures as soon as they cease; but sorrows, even when they cease after having long existed, are not directly missed; for only sorrow and want can be positively felt.—Prosperity, on the contrary, is merely negative. Hence we are not conscious of the three best possessions of life, youth, health, and freedom, as such, so long as they are ours, and do not become so till we have lost them, for then they are negations. We do not perceive that certain days of our lives were happy till they have given place to unhappy ones.' 'If, then, there were a hundred times less sorrow in the world than there is, its mere existence would be enough to confirm a truth, which is expressed in various ways, though always with some indirectness, namely: that the existence of the world is not a matter of rejoicing, but of grief, that its annihilation would be preferable to its existence, that it is fundamentally something which ought not to exist, &c.'—'Human life, far from wearing the aspect of a *gift*, has every appearance of an incurred *debt*, the payment of which is exacted in the



form of the urgent necessities, the tormenting desires, the unceasing want which life involves. The whole period of life is generally consumed in the liquidation of this debt, and yet it is only the interest which is hereby discharged. The payment of the capital is effected by death. And when was this debt contracted? At conception. Consequently, if we regard man as a being whose existence is a punishment and a penance, we shall be viewing him in a far more correct light. The myth of the Fall is the only thing in the Old Testament to which I can concede a metaphysical, though only an allegorical truth. New Testament Christianity, whose ethic spirit is that of Brahmanism and Buddhism, has also, very wisely, fastened upon this very myth.' 'If we would measure the degree of guilt with which our nature is infected, we must survey the suffering which is united with it. Every great sorrow, whether bodily or mental, declares what is our desert, for it could not come upon us if we did not deserve it.' But enough! Fortlage has compared this pessimism of Schopenhauer, and placed it side by side with the opinions of the Christian martyrs. (Compare *Frauenstädt Briefe über die Schopenhauersche Philosophie*, 1854, p. 329, etc.). But that positive element with which they opposed this world of pain and suffering escapes him. This positive element is not an 'ideal,' as Rudolf Seydel, who misses it in Schopenhauer, calls it in his treatise on Schopenhauer's philosophical system (Leipsic, 1857, p. 101, etc.), but the realities of atonement and redemption, of God's eternal world which is opened to us thereby, and of communion with Him.

(<sup>4</sup>) Lasaulx—*Ueber die Linosklage*, Würzburg, 1842—though seeing chiefly in these myths and lamentations (as the lamentations for Adonis in Syria, Egypt, &c., or for Narcissus and others) the lot of man himself depicted, yet acknowledges that they have a reference also to the great catastrophes of natural life; to spring, summer, autumn, and winter, to flowering and fading, growth and decay—in short, to all those sorrows and joys of nature with which the human mind sympathises,' p. 10. I may here perhaps be

allowed to refer to those well-known verses of Friedr. v. Schlegel :—

‘ *Noch deckt ein trüber Wittwenschleier  
Der künftigen Vollendung Feier,  
Und Trauer hüllt die Schöpfung ein ;  
Bis einst der Schleier wird gehoben,  
Muss ewig Klaggesang erhoben  
Von allein was da athmet sein.*’

‘ *Es geht ein allgemeines Weinen,  
So weit die stillen Sterne scheinen.  
Durch alle Adern der Natur.  
Es ringt und seufzt nach der Verklärung  
Entgegen schmachtend der Gewährung  
In Liebsangst die Kreatur.*’ \*

Also, a saying of Bettina v. Arnim, in Goethe’s *Briefwechsel mit einem Kind*, i. 33 : ‘ When one stands thus alone with nature, it seems as if she were a spirit praying to man for redemption. Is man then to redeem nature ? ’

(5) Compare the touching description of Vinet, in his sermon on Rom. iii. 11, St Paul’s criticism of human reason (*Evangelische Silberblicke, Reden, Predigten und Studien von Alex. Vinet*, translated by Lehman. Zwickau, 1863, p. 25). Also, Pascal, ii. 40, *Misère*, p. 79, &c. ; *Grandeur et Misère de l’Homme*, p. 136, &c., where he points out that Christianity alone is in possession of the true cure for human misery.

(6) Schelling’s *Sämmtl. Werke*, div. 1, vol. ix., p. 1 sq. On the connection between nature and the spirit-world : a dialogue, e.g., p. 55 : ‘ Death, said she (Clara), is nevertheless the deliverance of the inward form of life from the outward, which keeps it in subjection.’ ‘ And death is necessary, because these two forms of life, being unable to continue united after the degradation of nature to the merely external, must be separated.’

\* The sad veil of a widow still shrouds the festivity of future perfection, and a mourning garment covers creation.

One universal weeping goes through all the veins of nature wherever the quiet stars shine : creation, yearning for security, sighs and struggles for glorification in an agony of love.

(7) Similar reflections may be found in Pressensé's *Jesus Christ*, p. 211, a section which I had in view when writing as above.

(8) Compare "Lectures on Fundamental Truths," Lecture ii., note 14, and Lecture vii., note 9, and the passages there cited.

(9) See Naville, *Der himmlische Vater*, p. 290.

(10) Schiller, in the essay, *Etwas über die erste Menschengesellschaft nach dem Leitfaden der mosaischen Urkunde* (from Schiller's Lectures on Universal History before the University of Jena, which first appeared in the 11th No. of the *Thalia*. Works, in 12 vols, 1867, vol. 10, p. 380, &c.): 'Man was made complete as the plant or the animal was.' But he was 'to work himself upwards from a Paradise of ignorance and vassalage, to a Paradise of knowledge and freedom.' 'If we exchange the voice of God in Eden, forbidding him the tree of knowledge, for the voice of his instinct drawing him back from that tree, his supposed disobedience to the Divine command is nothing else than a revolt against his instinct, and therefore the first expression of his spontaneity, the first venture of his reason, the first beginning of his moral existence. This revolt of man against his instinct, which indeed introduced moral evil into creation, though only to make moral good possible therein, is incontrovertibly the happiest and greatest event in history; from this moment man's freedom dates, and it was here that the first foundation-stone of his morality was laid.' The same view is expressed by Hegel and Strauss on this subject. Hegel (*Philosoph. der Gesch.*, p. 233) says: 'The state of innocence, the Paradisaic state, is the animal one. Paradise is a park in which only animals, and not human beings, can remain. Hence the Fall, whereby man became truly man, is a universal myth.' And, lastly, Strauss (*Christl. Glaubenslehre*, ii. 29): 'Not God, who, as the primeval spirit, would treat the human spirit made after his

own image in a spiritual and liberal manner, but only a brutal subaltern, taking pleasure in imperiousness towards his inferiors, could have given such a command.'

(<sup>11</sup>) Scarcely anything better could be said on this matter than the words of Rousseau (*Vicaire Savoyard*): 'If man is active and free, his act is his own; what he does of his own free will, forms no part of the system of Providence, and cannot be attributed thereto. It does not cause the evil which man commits, when he abuses the freedom bestowed upon him. It made him free, not that he might do evil but good, of his free choice. To murmur against God because He does not hinder the practice of evil, means to reproach Him for giving to man a glorious nature, and to his acts a moral nobility, for bestowing upon him a title to virtue. What! in order to restrain man from evil, was He to limit him to instinct, to make him a mere animal?' (Quoted by Naville, *Der himml. Vater*, p. 288.)

(<sup>12</sup>) Pascal ii. 106: *le peché originel est folie devant les hommes. Mais cette folie est plus sage que toute la sagesse des hommes. Car sans cela, que dirait-on qu'est l'homme? Tout son état dépend de ce point imperceptible.*

(<sup>13</sup>) Lügen has collected these traditions in his work, *Die Traditionen des Menschengeschlechts*, 1856, p. 74, etc., a collection showing both the agreement of national traditions with the biblical narrative, and the great and undeniable superiority of the latter. A similar collection is given by Nicolas, *Philos. Studien über das Christenthum*, ii. 29, etc. Compare also Delitzsch, *Commentar über die Genesis*, 3d edit., 1860, p. 165, etc. Ottfr. Müller (*Geschichte der griechische Literatur*, i. 161) sees in the history of Japetos, as contained in Hesiod's theogony, remains of a profound poem on the lot of mankind by certain ancient minstrels. Japetos signifies the thrown down (ἰάπτω—Japetos is the father of Atlas, Prometheus, and Epimetheus) the human race driven from such happiness.

(<sup>14</sup>) Pascal, ii. 79; *Grandeur et Misère de l'homme*, p. 82: *Toutes ces misères-là même prouvent sa grandeur. Ce sont misères de grand seigneur, misères d'un roi déposé.* Compare also Nicolas, ii. 15-19, where excellent and affecting passages from Bossuet's Sermons are also quoted.

(<sup>15</sup>) Scripture sometimes calls the angels spirits, sometimes messengers (angels); alluding by the former designation to their nature, by the latter to their office. They differ from men by being incorporeal spirits, personal powers of incalculable numbers (Deut. xxxiii. 2; Ps. lxxviii. 18; Dan. vii. 10; Rev. v. 11), created by God (Col. i. 16) at the beginning of creation (Job xxxviii. 7). Unlike men, too, they do not form a unity, for they do not descend from each other, though they do form a kingdom composed of many members holding various ranks and offices (Eph. i. 21, iii. 10; Col. i. 16). They are superior to man in power and knowledge (*e.g.*, 2 Thess. i. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 1; and Matt. xxiv. 36), but inferior in destination; for they are not the object of God's creation and government, but only its means, ministering spirits to God's children (Heb. i. 14), and instruments of the connection of both angelic and national life with the kingdom of God.

(<sup>16</sup>) The doctrine of Satan is but gradually developed in Scripture. The history of the temptation (Gen. iii.) only hints at a spiritual background. Greater prominence is given to in "Asasel," the rite of the great day of atonement. In Job i. and ii. Satan appears as a seducing power—hostile, but subject, to God—among the "Sons of God," *i.e.*, the "ministering spirits;" and similarly does he appear (Zach. iii.) as the accuser, who advances his claim to sinners. That which in 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 is said to arise from the wrath of God is, in 1 Chr. xx. 1, attributed to him. In the N. T., on the other hand, a persuasion of the greatness of Satanic power is significantly prominent both in the consciousness of Christ and in the teaching of His apostles, and it may be easily seen and shown (*comp. e.g.* Matt. xii.



25-28, xiii. 39, xxv. 41, and the history of the temptation) that Jesus does not speak thus merely from accommodation, but from his own knowledge. St John, too, subsequently summarized the entire work of Christ by saying that He came to destroy the works of the devil (1 John iii. 8), an act figuratively represented in those expulsions of devils of which the evangelists, especially St Mark, relate so many. When it is said of the devil (1 John iii. 8) that he sinneth from the beginning, he is thereby designated as the originator of sin, as the seducer of other spirits who followed his example ('his angels,' Matt. xxv. 41; his kingdom, Matt. xii. 26). He is called 'the liar' (John viii. 44), because he deceived, and still deceives and tempts man by 'the deceitfulness of sin;' and the murderer (John viii. 44), because he thereby brought death upon mankind, whence sin and death are said to be the sphere of his dominion (Heb. ii. 14). He is the ruler of the world (2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12; 1 John v. 19), with whom Christians have constantly to contend (Eph. vi. 11 sq.); but they are assured of victory over him through Christ (John xii. 31), and of his final condemnation (1 Cor. xv. 24-26; Rev. xii. 9, xx. 10). The possibility of a union of superior intelligence with wickedness is expressed also by Cicero: *de Nat. Deor.* iii. 27; *Summa improbitate usus non sine summa ratione.*

(<sup>17</sup>) R. Schneider, in his interesting work, *Christliche Klänge aus den griech. und rom. Klassikern*, 1865, has collected (p. 133, etc.) a large number of those sayings of ancient authors, in which the universality of sin is expressed, e.g., *Soph. Antig.* 10, etc.: ἀνθρώποισι γὰρ τοῖς πᾶσι κοινόν ἐστι τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν (it is common to all men to sin). *Peccavimus omnes*, says Seneca (*De clem.*), *Nam vitiis nemo sine nascitur*, Horace (*Sat.* 1, 3, 68); and Simonides in Plato: εἶναι ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ἀδύνατον καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπειον, ἀλλὰ θεὸς μόνος τοῦτο ἔχει τὸ γέρας (for a man to be good is impossible, and surpasses human nature: God alone has this honour. Compare especially with the text that saying of Goethe in his Tasso (v. 2):



'Es liegt um uns herum  
 Gar mancher Abgrund den das Schicksal grub  
 Doch hier in unserm Herzen ist der tiefste.'\*

And Platen, i. 110, 'Antwort :'

'Abgründe liegen im Gemüthe  
 Die tiefer als die Hölle sind.' †

When Sulzer once announced to Frederick II., King of Prussia, that education had gone on well since it had been perceived that man was by nature good, and ought to be treated accordingly, Frederick replied: *Mon cher Sulzer, vous ne connaissez pas cette mauvaise race là.*

(18) Lenau, at the close of a sonnet, ii. 125 :

'Lieblos und ohne Gott! der Weg ist schaurig;  
 Der Zugwind in den Gassen lalt—und du?  
 Die ganze Welt ist zum verzweifeln traurig.' ‡

Heine (vol. d. L., 10 edit., p. 328) : The sick soul, the God-denying, angel-denying, unhappy soul. Disselhoff has collected a series of such expressions in a lecture entitled : The infidel poetry of modern times brought before its own tribunal (*Vorträge für das gebildete Publikum 3 Sammlung*, Elberfeld, 1864, p. 105).

(19) Compare 'Lectures on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity,' Lect. VI., p. 144-147.

(20) It is the special merit of Julius Muller to have reasserted the fact that selfishness constitutes the essence of sin (*Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, i. 140, etc.)§ So also, e.g., Sartorius, *Die Lehre von der heil., Liebe*, i. 62, etc. It was ever the prevalent doctrine of the Church to contrast the love of God, as real virtue, with the love of self, as

\* There lies around us full many an abyss which fate has dug, but the deepest is here in our heart.

† There are abysses in the mind which are deeper than hell.

‡ Without love, and without God, the way is terrible ;

The Wind moans in the streets—and thou ?

The whole world is desperately sad.

§ 'The Christian Doctrine of Sin.' Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 1868.

real sin. Compare also Pascal, ii. 56, etc.: *La nature de l'amour propre de ce moi humain est de n'aimer que soi et de ne considerer que soi.* The præ-Christian ages had no deep views of the nature of sin, because they were unacquainted with the highest moral standard. With them the essence of virtue consisted in a keeping within the bounds which are drawn around man as he is in himself, and in his various relations. Hence they regarded sin as the transgression of these bounds, the ὑβρις. Even Plato views good as the moderate (ἐμμετρον), evil as the immoderate (ἀμετρία).

(<sup>21</sup>) Romans vii. 14-21, is alluded to. Comp. Pascal, ii. 79: *'Guerre intestine de l'homme entre la raison et les passions. Il est toujours divisé et contraire à lui même,* p. 103: *quelle chimère est-ce donc que l'homme? Quelle nouveauté quel monstre, quel chaos, quel sujet de contradiction, quel prodige!* Also Rousseau, *Emile*, iv., p. 14: *'L'homme n'est point un; je veux et je ne veux pas, je me sens à la fois esclave et libre; je vois le bien, je l'aime, et je fais le mal,'* etc. Compare 'Lectures on the Fundamental Truths,' Lect. II. Note 2. Naville, *Das ewige Leben*, p. 129, cites some appropriate lines of Racine's on this subject of the internal discord; also Louis the Fourteenth's opinion confirming them. Mirabeau writes in the *Lettres à Chamfort*: "What a strange compound of levity and perversity is man! Man, who numbers the stars, who subdues the elements, who contends with the forces of nature, who is capable of everything—except of guiding himself and his fellow; who has discovered everything—except freedom and peace; has power to institute, but knows not how to direct; can cringe, but not obey; can rebel, but knows not how to defend himself; can love, but not love faithfully; bears within him, in his heart and mind, all the contrasts of good and evil." Jakobi, of whom Niebuhr says, "He was a man of unusual purity, he always seemed to us like a being from a better world, who was sojourning but for a brief space among us," confesses:—"It is very easy to do all kinds of good, and it is always a pleasure to act nobly. But to live without sin, without transgression—how diffi-

cult! but how far surpassing all else! To avoid evil demands powers of quite another kind, for this the whole man must collect all his strength, must exert himself often almost to his destruction, to find after all that the energies of his whole manhood were too feeble." Comp. Gelzer, *die Religion im Leben*, 1863, p. 84.

(<sup>22</sup>) Compare with this paragraph 'Lectures on the Fundamental Truths,' Lect. VII., p. 161, etc.; my *Lehre vom freien Willen*, p. 349, and pp. 454-456. The ancients also perceived that man is not able to effect a moral change in himself, e.g., Aristot., *Nikom. Ethik*, iii. 5, 14; and Celsus: 'It is, however, manifest to all, that no one can by punishment, much less by mercy, wholly change those who are by nature inclined and accustomed to crime; for wholly to change the nature is a matter beyond all things difficult.' (Neander, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, i. 3d edit., p. 15.) Compare also Schneider, *Christliche Klänge*, p. 134, etc.

(<sup>23</sup>) *Moral statistics* have of late been much dwelt on, especially since the works of Quetelet (*Sur l'Homme et le developpement de ses facultés*, 2 tomes, Paris, 1835; *Du système sociale*, Paris, 1841; *Sur la statist. morale*, in the *Mémoires de l'Acad. royale de sciences de Belge*, tome 21, Brussels, 1848) led the way in this direction. The facts collected by these statistics were immediately made prey of by materialism. Thus, F. G. Fischer (*Ueber die Freiheit des menschl. Willens*, Leipsic, 1858) revels in natural law; and Dankwardt (*Psychol. und Criminalrecht*, 1863) says briefly, and in capital type: 'MAN IS NOT FREE. He is as little responsible for his acts as the stone which wounds our head by obeying the law of gravitation; a crime is the necessary effect of a law of nature.' Adolf Wagner, on the contrary (*Ueber die Gesetzmässigkeit in den scheinbar willkürlichen Handlungen*, Hamb. 1864), though he says, indeed (i. p. 44), 'Society prepares crime; the criminal is only the instrument which carries it out,' yet leaves the problem essentially unsolved (i. 48). He acknowledges that the true causes cannot be inferred from the facts

alone ; that hence we cannot, without further ceremony, speak of constraining natural laws as abolishing responsibility ; that to know all the concurrent factors, and to compute their mathematical formula, we must be acquainted with the 'divine arithmetic ;' that consciousness of responsibility and of moral freedom in individual cases is also 'a fact,' which is as certain to the reason as this conformity to law ; that the whole question is only the old problem under a new form—a problem which statistics will never be able to solve. The question raised by these interesting statistical labours has been variously treated, both in its theological and philosophical aspect, in the interest of defending man's freedom of will. In the first, in the *Erlänger Zeitschr für Protestantism. und Kirche*, 1865 ; *Zur Apologetik*, iv., pp. 199-238 (by Prof. Frank ?) ; in the latter by Dobrisch, *Die Moralische Statistik*, 1867 ; by Vorländer, in an article on moral statistics and moral freedom (*Zeitschrift für Staatswissenschaft*, 1866, iv., p. 477, etc.) ; and by Carrière in the *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung*, 1867, No. 113 ; Appendix : *Natürliche und sittliche Weltordnung*. We must not—says the theological article—confound freedom and lawlessness, accident and arbitrariness, for this is the atomistic individualising view of Pelagianism, which severs man from his historical connections. These historical connections involve opportunity, but not absolute necessity. Circumstances influence the decision of the individual, but the latter *suffers* himself to be thus influenced. They who do not suffer their decision to be thus influenced, but, in spite of the obstacles of outward circumstances (famine, etc.), *e.g.*, contract marriage, are not freer than others because they do so.

Thus, then, the increase or decrease of certain human actions, which statistics show to be dependent on external causes, is no proof of the absence of freedom in those transactions. Such influences upon the free choice are of universal occurrence. The fact that an act is the result of reasonable deliberation, does not make it cease to be an act of freedom. It is by external circumstances and their influence that the Divine government of the world is

carried on. It is in conformity to law that Divine causality, 'the secret will of God,' as Luther calls it, is apparent. Certainly the question becomes more difficult in the case of actions morally reprehensible. But what statistics designate the 'next cause,' is generally compounded of many causes. Age, sex, etc., are no special causes, and special causes do not come within the range of statistics. Their influence only varies according to age, etc. The seductiveness, too, of these causes is of various strength, according to age, etc. Yet this does not abolish individual freedom ; for the moral condition of the subject which turns the scale, is itself the product of moral decisions. In his external actions, moreover, man is fitted into a groove of circumstances and forces which in many ways determine the external form of his actions. God has indeed left man free to choose to be ungodly, not free to institute an arbitrary chaos ; for He provides for order, regularity, conformity to law even in the process of the development of sin. God's hand so guides the threads, that even in the web of sin law is apparent, the maintenance of which, in the midst of human perversity and sin, is His prerogative. The figures of statistics are but the rays by which the fact of this secret world-ruling will of God, with its conformity to law, shines forth.—Drobisch, too, reminds that a distinction must be made between human, relative, non-absolute freedom of will and arbitrariness, and that no choice is devoid of motive. But he lays more emphasis on the fact that the resolve is determined partly by the personal character, and partly by external circumstances, so that the individual act of the will appears as the necessary result of these various factors. This seems to me a more decided denial of the *possibility* of arbitrariness than I can think correct.—Vorländer well shows that, with respect to the question of free will, these negative consequences cannot be deduced from the experience of external facts without logical leaps ; and also lays stress upon the natural limits of the decisions of the will.—Carrière shows, by individual examples from occurrences in Bavaria, how easy it is to draw false conclusions, involving principles, from certain facts, whose accidental



social causes may be unknown to statisticians, and refers to the fact of the moral consciousness. On this ground, he rejects the opinion of Buckle (in his *History of Civilisation in England*), whose words shall be quoted to conclude this note, and to show how these things are looked upon from his point of view. 'In a given state of society, a certain number of persons must put an end to their own life. This is the general law ; and the special question as to who shall commit the crime depends, of course, upon special laws ; which, however, in their total action, must obey the large social law to which they are all subordinate ; and the power of the larger law is so irresistible, that neither the love of life nor the fear of another world can avail anything towards even checking its operation.' Carrière rightly denies the proposition. 'The must, the constraining law,' he says, 'does not exist.'—Professor A. von Oettingen, of Dorpat, has collected in the first part of his *Social Ethics* '*Die Moralstatistik*,' an inductive proof of the conformity to law exhibited by moral life in the organism of humanity (Erl. 1868), very copious and valuable materials in proof of this double position viz: On the one hand that the freedom of uncaused self-determination does not exist, but that the spiritual life is, on the contrary, universally conditioned by the fact that the individual together with his actions, is always so dove-tailed into the whole society, that a constant interaction is ever taking place between the collective and the individual personality, in consequence of which the moral world moves as much in conformity with Divine laws as the physical, (*Quetelet Système Social*, p. 9 : *Je n' ai d' autre but que de montrer qu' il existe des lois divines et des principes de conservation dans un monde (viz le monde moral) où tant d' autres s'obstinent à ne trouver qu' un chaos désordonné.* On the other, that this conformity to law answers to the nature of this *moral* world without prejudice to freedom, and hence that natural necessity and absolute connection cannot, without farther ceremony, be inferred from mere regularity of facts, and that succession and contemporaneousness must not be confounded with causality nor converted into 'natural laws ;' in short,



that conformity to law and freedom do not contradict but mutually condition each other. Why are moral statistics chiefly occupied with crime, and much less, or even not at all, with well-doing? This one consideration suffices to prove the weakness of the conclusions which have been built thereupon.

(<sup>24</sup>) Compare the fine paragraph of Naville, *Der himml. Vater*, pp. 215-235. Bruch, too, of Strasburg, in a very appreciative notice of this work, takes occasion to speak as follows of this denial of the moral view of actions. 'When Macaulay, the famous English historian, expresses his abhorrence of those authors who try to justify crime and make virtue ridiculous, M. Taine remarks (*Essais de Critique et d'Histoire*, p. 8, *sq.*): 'Criticism moves more freely in France. If we try to relate the life of a man, or to exhibit his character, we like to look upon him as an object of painting or science. We do not judge him; we desire merely to exhibit him, and make him comprehensible to the understanding. We are desirous of knowledge, and nothing else. Peter or Paul may have been a rogue; that concerned his contemporaries, but is a matter of indifference to us. They suffered from his crimes. To-day we are out of his power, and with the danger our hatred has vanished. I feel neither dislike nor disgust; I have left these feelings at the door of history, and I enjoy the very deep and very pure feeling of seeing a soul treated according to a definite law.' Let it not be thought that this passage expresses only the aberrations of a young and immature mind; it expresses, on the contrary, as Naville justly remarks, the theory of a whole school. This theory is clearly and definitely stated in the *Revue des deux Mondes* (Feb. 15, 1861, p. 855): 'We have nothing to do with morality, but only with custom; nothing with principles, but only with facts. We explain everything, and, as has been truly said, the mind finishes with allowing everything which it explains. Modern virtue resolves itself into toleration (*se résume dans la tolerance*). This is an immense innovation! Whatever is, has for us a right to be.' How deeply such principles have penetrated into the

opinions of the present day, is proved by the repeated attempt to whitewash the most abominable characters. This theory may be said to be the expression of an absolutely *blasé* state of existence.

(<sup>25</sup>) *Tacit. Ann.* vi. 6. Compare Nicolas, i. 103.

(<sup>26</sup>) Tholuck gives extracts from Plutarch's work on the 'Fear of the Gods,' in *Der sittliche Charakter des Heidenthums*, p. 42, sq.). 'The physician—it is thus that Plutarch describes his unhappy ones—is driven away by the sick, the consoling friend by the afflicted.' He exclaims, 'Leave me, O man, me, the accursed, the hated of gods and demons, to suffer my punishment.' 'He sacrifices and trembles, he prays with a faltering voice, he scatters incense with trembling hands.' On the Flagellants, compare, e.g., *Gieseler Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 509 ; iii. 273, sq.\*

(<sup>27</sup>) Among the ancients it was chiefly the history of Orestes the matricide which gave poets occasion to depict the torments of a guilt-laden conscience. So Eschylus, in the Trilogy of Orestes (Agamemnon, Choephores, Eumenides, =guilt, revenge, expiation), especially Choephores, 1010-1062 ; Euripides, Orestes, 284-292. Juvenal, Satire iii., 190-244 ; xiii., 192, sq. :

"Consciousness of crime constantly terrifies the wicked and lacerates them with silent stripes. For the soul itself secretly wields the torturing scourge. But the punishment is stern, and it is far more horrible than any which the severity of Caeditius and Rhadamanthus invents, to bear about day and night the witness in one's own breast, &c." —a description which recalls Shakespeare's Richard III. and Macbeth, those powerful tragedies of a guilty conscience. Compare also, among modern poets, Lenau (14th ed. 1855), ii. 113 ; 'Frage,' p. 126 ; 'Palliativ,' i. 55 ; 'Nebel :

'Nimm fort im deine graue Nacht,  
Die Erde weit und breit ;

---

\* 'Gieseler's Church History.' Clark's Foreign Theological Library.

*Nimm fort was mich so traurig macht,  
Auch die Vergangenheit!'* \*

Or the *Sehnsucht nach Vergessen*, i. 50 ; or, ii. 117, where he sees in askesis an involuntary testimony to a feeling of guilt.

Platen (1853), i. 91 (1820) :

' *Wie rafft ich mich auf in der Nacht, in der Nacht.*' †

Goethe :

*'Ihr stürzt ins Leben ihn hinein,  
Ihr lasst den Armen schuldig werden ;  
Dann überlasst ihr ihn der Pein,  
Denn jede Schuld rächt sich auf Erden.'* ‡

(<sup>28</sup>) This is a fundamental thought of Shakespeare's moral views, as touchingly exhibited, *e.g.*, in 'Macbeth.' Platen, indeed, says,—

*'Ich fühlte dass die Schuld die uns aus Eden bannte,  
Schwungfedern uns zum Flug nach höhern Himmel leihe ;'* §

but with what right, every one may know from his own experience.

### NOTES TO LECTURE III.

(<sup>1</sup>) To this saying of Lenau may be added the manifold confessions of other celebrities. I confine myself here to those of Schiller and Goethe. The former writes from Mannheim to Körner, Feb. 10, 1795 : 'I must come to you—with you I shall be happy. *I have never yet been so.* Weep for me, that I am obliged to make such a confession. I have not yet been happy. For fame and admiration, and all the other accompaniments of authorship, cannot balance even one moment which friendship and love prepare. The heart starves in the midst of it all.' And, Aug. 20, 1788 : 'I can, at no moment, say that I am happy. You will ask, What then do I desire? I do not myself know.' And further, in his conversations with Eckermann, 1,106, he

\* Take away in thy grey night, the wide, broad earth ; take away also that past which makes me so sad.

† How I snatched myself up in the night, in the night.

‡ You plunge him into life, you let the poor creature become guilty, then you deliver him up to punishment, for all guilt is avenged upon earth.

§ I felt that the guilt which banished us from Eden, furnished me with fresh pinions to soar to a higher heaven.

says : ' I have always been esteemed a man specially favoured by fortune ; and I neither wish to complain nor to murmur at the course of my life. But, in reality, it has been nothing but pains and labour, and I may truly say, that during my seventy-five years I have not had four weeks of real pleasure. It has been the perpetual rolling of a stone which has to be picked up again and again.'

(2) Compare Vinet, p. 24 ; on the preceding, Vinet, p. 69.

(3) Auerbach, *Auf der Höhe*, iii., 235, 279 : ' Rest and peace are nowhere in this world.'

Lenau, i. 249 ; ii. 58.

The following saying from Auerbach, *Auf der Höhe*, (*Irma's Tagebuch*).

(4) *Regis*, 1842, No. 114, p. 245 :

' *Kein Malen stillt noch Meisseln mehr die Seele,  
Sie flieht zu jenem liebevollen Gott,  
Der uns am Kreuz die Arm entgebreitet.*' \*

(5) If we inquire, e.g., of those poets who refer us to our own strength, we find that they do not themselves believe in their strength. They get no further than a 'perhaps.' So Platen :

' *Wo ist das Herz das keine Schmerzen spalten ?  
Und wer ans Weltenende flüchten würde,  
Stets folgten ihm des Lebens Truggestalten,  
Ein Trost nur bleibt mir dass ich jeder Bürde,  
Vielleicht ein Gleichgewicht vermag zu halten,  
Durch meiner Seele ganze Kraft und Würde.*' †

How little comfort, however, this uncertain hope affords him, those other well-known words of the same poet prove :

' *Es liegt an eines Menschen Schmerz, an eines Menschen Wunde nichts,  
Es kehrt an das was Kranke quält sich ewig der Gesunde nichts,*

---

\* No painting nor sculpture can give peace to the soul ; it flees to that loving God who stretches out His arms to us from the cross.

† Where is the heart unriven by sorrows ? and if any one would flee to the ends of the world, the deceptions of life would continually follow him. One comfort alone is left me, that I may, *perhaps*, with the whole might and dignity of my soul, be able to counterbalance every burden.

*Und wäre nicht das Leben kurz, das stets der Mensch vom Menschen erbt,  
So gäb's Beklagenswertheres auf diesem weiten Runde nichts.'* \*

To own, however, that we know of no other comfort than death, is to own that we know of none.

(<sup>6</sup>) Auerbach (*Auf der Höhe*) entitles the wisdom of the old Count Eberhard, ii. 319, &c., 'Self-redemption;' iii. 168, 'there is nothing but self-help.' The subsequent expressions, ii. 320; iii. 170.

(<sup>7</sup>) Compare Vinet, p. 155, 159; and the fine passage of Rückert:

*'Du findest in dir die Ruhe nicht  
Den milden Hauch von Gottes Gnaden,  
So lang von deiner Schuld Gewicht  
Du willst ein Theil auf Andre laden.  
Nicht wenn du das was dich gelenkt  
Von dem was du gethan hast trennest;  
Dir ist die Schuld nur ganz geschenkt,  
Wenn du zur ganzen dich bekennest.'* †

(<sup>8</sup>) Auerbach<sup>†</sup> offers a striking proof of this in his romance, *Auf der Höhe*. Irma had during four years been performing almost superhuman penance. 'There are saints even in our days,' is said concerning her penance (iii. 484). And yet Auerbach cannot refrain from making this penance, of which his hero, the physician Gunther, says (p. 491), 'Thou hast made expiation,' conclude with a prayer for forgiveness from the queen she has injured. Not till then does Irma get peace. P. 491: 'Ah, thou art here at last! gasped Irma, drawing a deep breath. She raised herself up with her latest strength, and knelt up in her bed; she folded her hands, and then, stretching out her arms, she exclaimed, in

\* There is no remedy for human pain, for human wounds. The healthy man cares nothing for what torments the sick. And if the life which man ever inherits from man were not short, there would be nothing more pitiable upon this earth.

† Thou dost not find rest within thee, the gentle breath of God's mercy, so long as thou wilt heap one portion of the weight of thy guilt upon another; nor when thou separatest what impelled thee from what thou hast done. Thy guilt is only wholly remitted when thou acknowledgest the whole.



heart-piercing tones : " Pardon, pardon ! " ' Is this close of the drama dictated merely by æsthetic feeling, and not also by the involuntary testimony of the moral feeling to truth, a *testimonium animæ naturaliter christiane* ?

(<sup>9</sup>) Compare the famous passage in the ' Merchant of Venice ' :

' It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven  
Upon the place beneath : it is twice bless'd ;  
It blesseth him that gives, and him that takes :  
'Tis mightiest in the mightiest ; it becomes  
The throned monarch better than his crown ;  
His sceptre shows the force of temporal power,  
The attribute to awe and majesty,  
Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings ;  
But mercy is above this sceptred sway,  
It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,  
It is an attribute to God himself,  
And earthly power doth then show likest God's  
When mercy seasons justice.'

(<sup>10</sup>) Humboldt, *Kosmos II.*, 116 sq. It is peculiarly characteristic of the Hebrew poetry of nature ever to present, by its view of the unity of the entire universe, a reflection of the belief in God's unity. Nature is not described as something existing for itself, as glorified by its own beauty, it always appears to the poet in its relation to an overruling spiritual power. Nature is to him a thing created and ordered, a lively expression of the omnipresence of God in the works of that world which is the object of the senses. It might be said that in this single 104th psalm is contained an image of the whole universe. It astonishes us to see all heaven and earth depicted by a few broad strokes in a poem of such small compass. Man's dull and troublesome labour, from the rising of the sun till the close of his day's work at evening, is here contrasted with the movements of nature. The contrast, the universality in which the reciprocal influence of various phenomena are viewed, this regard to the all-present invisible power which can renew the earth or shatter it to dust, forms the solemn element in a poem not more charming than sublime.



(<sup>11</sup>) Psalm viii. The intention of this Psalm is to depict the position secured to man in creation, by contrasting his seeming meanness, on the one hand, with his high vocation with regard to the world and the kingdom of God on the other—a vocation which found its higher fulfilment in Jesus Christ, Heb. ii., 5, sq.

(<sup>12</sup>) Œd. Col. 1276 :

‘Yet as mercy ruling shares the throne of Zeus to adjust every work, so, O father, let it also prevail with thee !’

(<sup>13</sup>) The thoughts which follow, are further carried out in my *Lehre vom freien Willen*, p. 436, sq.

(<sup>14</sup>) Compare, in Neander’s *Denkw.* i. 27, &c., the expressions of desire for a revelation of mercy expressed at the conclusion of the ancient world, e.g., by Porphyry who speaks of ‘those who, longing after truth, once prayed that a vision of the gods might be vouchsafed to them, that so they might, by means of well authenticated information, be set free from their doubts.’ Also the touching description of the inward restlessness and craving of Clement of Rome (from the *Recognitions*), a description evidently taken from life. On the similar development, in the case of Justin, compare ‘Lectures on Fundamental Truths,’ Lecture VIII., p. 214. Pascal ii. 96 : *Il est bon d’être lassé et fatigué par l’inutile recherche du vrai bien, afin de tendre les bras au libérateur.*

(<sup>15</sup>) On the maxim, that whatever is best is freely and graciously given, compare ‘Lectures on Fundamental Truths,’ Lecture VII., p. 176. The opinion of the natural mind on this point is shown by Celsus, who esteems it one of the follies of Christianity, that it should call sinners into the kingdom of God. ‘They say that God accepts the sinner, if he humbles himself on account of his vileness, but will not accept the just man who virtuously looks up to Him from the beginning’ (Neander, *Denkw.* i. 13). Seneca, on the other hand, says, Ep. 52 : *Nemo per se satis valet ut emergat; oportet manum aliquis porrigat, aliquis educat.*

## NOTES TO LECTURE IV.

(<sup>1</sup>) Starting from this supposition, Strauss entitles his critique of Schleiermacher's *Leben Jesu*, 'The Christ of Faith, and the Jesus of History' (1865). In his view, the Christology of Schleiermacher is the last attempt and failure to reconcile the faith of the Church and the history of Jesus, the ideal and the historic Christ. 'Once for all, it will not do.' Especially pp. 209-223. Compare also my Lecture: *Die modernen Darstellungen des Lebens Jesu*, 2d edition, 1864, p. 9, etc.

(<sup>2</sup>) On Plato's picture of the suffering righteous man, compare my 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture VIII., p. 211. Aristotle generally founds his decisions concerning what is morally right on the standard of the ideal virtuous man, and draws a picture of an ideal morality in his description of the high-minded man (*μεγαλόψυχος*), *Eth. Nicom.* iv. 3; but it is really only a picture of pride, if not of arrogance, which he sketches. The Stoic ideal, moreover, which according to Cicero's confession (*Tusc.* ii. 32), was never yet realised, is pride personified.

(<sup>3</sup>) The ancient ideal is conscious pride—even in the Aristotelian ethics, *e.g.*, in the description of the high-minded man (iv. 2, 24; v. 5, etc.); while humility is entirely absent from the notion of ancient morality. Compare 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture VIII., p. 203.

(<sup>4</sup>) A coarse attempt to do so was formerly made by Reimarus (*Wolfenb. Fragm.*), who attributed to Jesus a political plan, the failure of which He is said to have deplored on the cross, when He uttered the words: 'My God,' etc. *Vom Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger* (7 *Fragm.*, edited by Lessing, 1778; section II., § 3-8). It is not in the rude and arbitrary manner of the Fragmentist, but as the necessary result of His true humanity, that the modern works on His life by Schenkel and Strauss—to say nothing of the

indignities done Him by Renan—have denied the sinlessness of Jesus. Because Jesus calls Himself lowly, says Schenkel, He must have had to contend with pride (2d Edition, 1864, p. 170); when He says none is good but God, He declares Himself to be not good in this sense; He knew the sinful motions of flesh and blood from His own experience (pp. 288-290), and therefore He could pray with His disciples, 'Forgive us our debts, our trespasses' (p. 368). Strauss, on the contrary, thinks himself justified in calling it not merely fanaticism, but 'unjustifiable self-exaltation for a man to imagine himself so separated from other men as to set himself before them as their future judge' (*Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 242). Keim has, however, already given a sufficient answer to all this. Compare my Lecture, *Die modernen Darstellungen*, etc., p. 47.

( ) Compare Lüken *Die Traditionen*, etc., p. 308. The apologists of the ancient church, as Justin *Apol.* i., 22; Origen. *c. Celsus* i., 37, appeal to the Hellenic myths of sons of the gods, to point out that a virgin birth is not contrary to reason.

(<sup>6</sup>) This forms the difference between the Romish and Protestant veneration of Mary. Hase, in his *Handbuch der protest Polemik*, 2d edit., 1865, p. 317, shows from history how that glorification of Mary which introduced into the worship of the Romish Church a suspicious element of sensuous fancy, and at length so choked the healthy evangelical elements, that the Romish Church became, to use Pusey's expression, 'the Church of Mary,' and the sole Mediatorship of Jesus Christ was very greatly prejudiced, arose gradually from the ancient custom of contrasting Eve with Mary, and from a spurious over-estimation of the state of virginity, combined with the natural attraction towards what was womanly and pleasing to the senses. The legends of the Romish Church concerning Mary are chiefly derived from the apocryphal gospels, which, though rejected by the Church, have actually had almost more influence in it than the canonical. And not only have the Jesuits and Pius

IX., that special worshipper of Mary, raised her to a super-human dignity, but even German theologians, *e.g.*, Hettinger II., i., 507, take up this tone, concealing the absence of Scriptural authority for so doing by a mixture of poetry, imagination and arbitrary assertion. Hettinger calls Mary 'Prophetess and Queen of Prophets,' 'the Highpriestess,' p. 517, 'a living Holy of Holies, a tabernacle built by the hand of God,' 'Mother and Queen of the New Covenant,' for so the Divine Son entitled her in his last hour, John xix., 27 : 'Behold thy mother,' p. 518. 'She is the mother of the true body of Christ, and therefore the mother of His mystical body, the Church,' p. 519. Hence results the justification of her right to the title of mediatrix. 'Her participation in the work of redemption is special and direct, and only surpassed by the work of the Redeemer Himself. Her *Fiat* (*fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum*) corresponded with the creative *fiat*,' p. 520. She has a central position in the economy of salvation,' p. 523. The history of Christ being an eternal one, 'Mary also ever exercises her mediatorial office with the Son,' p. 524, etc. All these fanciful notions, however, are shattered by the two passages of Scripture which are appealed to in their behalf. The first of these is the angelic salutation, Luke i., 28, 'Hail thou that art highly favoured (*κεχαριτωμένη*) ; The Lord is with thee'—the words following : 'blessed art thou among women' must, according to the oldest MSS., be expunged.—Mary is not here called 'full of grace,' *gratiarum plena*, as the Romish translation has it, but the favoured of God. Hence she does not impart favour or grace, but has herself received it from God. The other passage too, John xix., 26, 27 : 'Woman, behold thy son,' 'Behold thy mother,' does not mean that Mary is, as a mother, to take charge of John and of all believers, but that John is to care for Mary who was now growing old, as a son for his mother. It is a saying expressing the care of Jesus, not for believers, but for his mother, He who had at the marriage at Cana dissolved the connexion between Himself and His mother, so far as His office was concerned, by the saying : Woman, what have I to do with thee ? fully dissolves it from the cross,

because he is now entering upon a life for which she is no longer his mother. Thus this very passage refutes all the inferences which have been drawn from it, in favour of Romish doctrine. And the rest of Scripture confirms this conclusion. For after Mary has been once more mentioned, Acts i. 14, together with other believers, she is named no more, but disappears entirely from the scene. Of her subsequent history nothing is known, God bestowed upon this humble and believing daughter of Israel the favour of selecting her for the mother of the Saviour, and to have humbly bowed to this decree, and faithfully and submissively endured all the bitter sorrow connected therewith—a pattern of humility and fidelity to all ages—this is her fame which is not to be taken from her.

(7) This applies not only to rationalistic and recent theology, but also to Schleiermacher's deductions, and to the attempt of the Berlin General Synod of 1836. For Schleiermacher in his *Glaubenslehre*, § 97, 2 (ii., p. 70) declares this dogma of the Church to be, both religiously and doctrinally unimportant, and esteems it sufficient to reduce it to the influence of the Divine Spirit at the origination of a natural life; and the Synod in question, acting upon Schleiermacher's criticism, expunged this dogma from the confession of faith to be used at ordination. When the genealogies are appealed to in opposition to the gospel account of the miraculous origin of Jesus, as being documents which presuppose the paternity of Joseph, it is forgotten that in Israel, the descent of the son was determined by that, not of the mother, but of the father, whether the latter were the father in the natural, or merely in the legal sense. Hence, Joseph's descent from David is repeatedly dwelt upon in the gospels, because it was on this that the membership of Jesus in the house of David legally depended. It is possible to reconcile the discrepancy of the two genealogies in various ways. That the miraculous origin of Jesus should be spoken of neither by Himself nor Mary, was naturally to be expected. For how was it possible



for Mary to mention it publicly? And Jesus would not use this mystery as a means of faith, for it was to be not the means but the reward of faith. Hence He leaves it to faith itself to advance by degrees, during the course of its internal development, to this necessary consequence of the Divine sonship of Jesus. The other books of the New Testament, moreover, especially the Pauline epistles, far from contradicting, help to confirm this doctrine. The passage, Gal. iv. 4, would alone suffice to prove this. And when St Paul presupposes the prae-mundane existence of Christ (*e.g.*, Phil. ii. 6) the fact that his human life originated not by human generation, but by a Divine operation, is but a necessary consequence. Nor would it be otherwise by the very nature of the thing. For Christ was to be not the product of mankind, but a gift of God which was to enter into, and be received by it. And what is true of Christ is true of Christianity. For in this dogma the nature of Christianity also is manifested to be both new and supernatural.

(<sup>8</sup>) 'The Son of Man' is the most usual title of the Lord Jesus, and that by which He specially designates Himself in the Gospels (in these it occurs more than eighty times; once only out of the Gospels, Acts xii. 56, and nowhere in the Epistles). It was formerly regarded as denoting, upon the authority of Dan. vii. 13, nothing more than that He was the Messiah; but Matt. xvi. 13, 16, and John xii. 34, speak against such a restriction of its interpretation. The way to the correct understanding of this title was struck out by Hofmann in his work: *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, ii. 19, etc., and in his *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, 78; while the *Weissäcker Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1859, 4, Baur, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftliche Theol.*, iii. 3, 274, and Kahnis, in his *luther. Dogmatik*, i. 416, followed in the same direction. It points out that Jesus is the end and aim of human history, He that was to come. Thus this designation is allied to St. Paul's view of Christ as the second Adam (Rom. v. 12, etc.; 1 Cor. xv. 45). Starting from this idea of the central and universal relation of Christ to all mankind, modern theology, especially



Schleiermacher and his school, has endeavoured again to attain to the knowledge of the higher significance of Christ. This is well, if only we do not stop here, but combine with the idea of the Son of Man that of the Son of God, which is not—as has been lately supposed—identical with it. The former denotes Christ's relation to man and to the world, the latter His relation to God. He is the former because He is the latter. I may perhaps be allowed to refer, on this subject, to the Lecture I delivered at Bremen (*Die Person Jesu Christi*), which forms the fourth of a course of nine Lectures on certain important questions and truths of Christianity, etc. Published by the Committee of the Association for the Inner Missions in Bremen. Gotha F. A. Perthes, 1869.

(<sup>9</sup>) The absolute relation of Jesus to the world, as depending upon His relation to God, is summed up (Matt. xi. 27). This may be stated under its separate heads, as follows: With relation to the Old Testament, He is the desire of the Old Testament saints (Matt. xiii. 17); to the Old Testament Church He is the bridegroom of the Church (Matt. ix. 15); to individual souls, the soul finds rest in Him (Matt. xi. 29); to the human race, His Gospel must be everywhere preached (Matt. xxv. 14); and He will gather all nations into His Church (Matt. xxviii. 19); to the world in general, He is the Judge of the whole world (Matt. xxv. 34), etc.

(<sup>10</sup>) This difference between the fourth and the first three Gospels was early noticed; and in the ancient Church,—in the Alexandrian theology,—the fourth Gospel was called the spiritual Gospel, and was regarded with special estimation. Compare Luther, 'the unique, tender, genuine, chief Gospel, far preferable to the other three' (*Werke, Erl. Edit.*, lxiii. 115); and Matth. Claudius (i. 8): 'There is something so wonderful about it—twilight and night, and through both the swiftly darting lightning!—a gentle cloud of evening, and, behind the cloud, the great full moon bodily!—something so melancholy, so sublime, so presen-

tient, that one is never satiated. Whenever I read St John's Gospel, I seem to see him lying on his Master's breast at the Last Supper ; I seem to see his spirit holding up a light to me, and, at certain passages, falling upon my neck and whispering in my ear. I am far from understanding all I read ; yet it often seems as though his meaning were hovering in the far distance before me ; and even when I am considering a totally obscure passage, I have still a presentiment of a great and glorious meaning, which I shall one day understand, and therefore I seize with such avidity upon every fresh exposition, upon every new explanation of St John. Most, indeed, only skim the evening cloud, and leave alone the moon behind it.'—In modern times this difference has been exaggerated into a contrast ; but without reason ; for what is stated in the text shows that even the first three Gospels furnish points of connection for the instruction in St John's. The former represent the earlier stages of Christian teaching, St John's the higher ; the former represent rather the historical, the latter the eternal existence of Christ ; the former His relation to the world, the latter His relation to God. But the latter forms the postulate of the former, and is the substructure on which they are based.

(<sup>11</sup>) Jesus ascribes to Himself a direct relation to God : with reference to life : He has it in Himself, as the Father hath (John v. 26)—with reference to His work : the work of God is performed by Him (John v. 17, etc.) ; with reference to His power : He and the Father are one (John x. 30) ; with reference to His being : there is absolute communion between the two (x. 38, xiv. 10, ch. xvii.)—hence, He is the presence of God himself (xiv. 9) ; and disposes of the Spirit of God at His will, and for His service (xvi. 7, etc., 13, etc.). This is only comprehensible, if His communion with the Father did not take place in time, but existed from eternity, and merely took this historical form in the present. Hence Jesus emphatically teaches us His existence with the Father before He became man (John iii. 13 ; vi. 38, 46, 51 ; viii. 42 ; xvi. 28 ; and, indeed, that

this existence is a personal and eternal one (vii. 58), in the communion of the Divine glory and love (xvii. 5, 24). On this account, also, He accepts the confession of Thomas : ' My Lord and my God ' (John xx. 28), and speaks of it as the true expression of faith in Him. It is upon the ground of this self-testimony of Jesus that St John, at the beginning of his Gospel, designates Him, in his famous triad of propositions, as the Word which was with God, and which was God.

(<sup>12</sup>) Examples of the invocation of the Lord Jesus in prayer occur in Acts vii. 59 ; Rev. xxii. 20. Christians, too, are, in the New Testament, generally designated as those who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus (as in the Old Testament the name of Jehovah was called on). Compare Rom. x. 13 ; Acts ix. 14, 21 ; 1 Cor. i. 2 (upon the ground of John v. 27).

(<sup>13</sup>) Pliny, at the beginning of the second century, in consequence of the inquiries he had instituted, wrote concerning the Christians in his letter to Trajan (Ep. x. 96) : *Quod essent soliti statō die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere*. And this custom of praising Christ in hymns, as God, is corroborated by the Church historian Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 28), who speaks of the psalms and odes of primitive times, in which Christ was praised as God : *ψαλμοὶ ὅσοι καὶ ᾠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσθαι, τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνοῦσι θεολογοῦντες*.

(<sup>14</sup>) These thoughts are specially carried out in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians (compare Eph. i. 10 ; Col. i. 20). Hence originated the view, which regards the incarnation as not merely effected for the purpose of taking away sin, but as necessary, even if sin had not existed, for the realisation of the ideal of man, and for the bestowal of a head upon the human race—a speculative view advocated in former times, especially by certain mystics, in modern, by theosophists, as Franz v. Baader, etc.,

and by theologians, as especially Dorner, etc. This notion has no adequate support from Scripture, and differs from primitive doctrine. It is opposed especially by Jul. Muller (*deutsche Zeitschr für Christl. Leben*, etc., 1850, No. 40, etc.) and Thomasius.

(<sup>15</sup>) How the heathen world strove after, yet failed to attain to, the idea of the God-man, is stated by Dorner in his *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, ii., pp. 4-15. The Messianic traditions of various nations are collected by Lüken in his *Die Traditionen*, etc., p. 300 sq. The East had its incarnations, the West its apotheoses. Both have a prophetic significance, as expressions of the ardent longing to bridge over the abyss which separates the holy God from sinful man.

(<sup>16</sup>) This notion of the absolute necessity of the incarnation of God in Christ, even if man had not sinned, is advocated by most recent theologians, especially by the tendency which follows Schleiermacher, e.g., Nitzsch, Martensen, Liebner, Lange, Rothe, Dorner (compare his *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von d Person Christi* ii., 1243, sq.). Jul. Muller (*Deutsche Zeitseprift für christl. Wissensch*, 1850, No. 40), and Thomasius (*Christi Person und Werke*, i. (2nd edition), 1856, § 22, p. 202, sq. § 26, p. 261, sq.) have emphatically pronounced against it. And justly so. From Schleiermacher's stand-point, indeed, this notion is a necessary one. For if Christ is—according to Schleiermacher—only the end of creation, the ultimate development of the Divine germ deposited beforehand in human nature, his appearance is—if mankind is to attain the end for which it was made—an absolute necessity. Such a Christ is, however only the realizer of that communion with God which is implanted in us all ; and not the *restorer* of that which sin had destroyed, not God and man in one person, the God-man properly so-called. Hence this view only brings about, by one of three ways—viz., by the (ethically conceived) idea of God, by the idea of man, or by the idea of religion,—the highest degree of what theology calls the *unio mystica* of

God and man, to which we are all to attain. It seeks to construct a Christ by speculation, instead of learning to understand him by the history of his work of salvation.

(17) The first task of the Church, in laying down the doctrine of the person of Jesus Christ, was to establish the truth that two natures are united in Christ the God-man—the Divine and the human—the second, to make evident to the mind the personal unity of these two natures. The Godhead of Jesus was denied by Jewish opinion, which saw in Jesus only a prophet filled with the Spirit of God, though the greatest of the prophets (Ebionitism); His proper humanity, by heathen opinion, which recognised in Christ an exalted spiritual being, going about the world in a phantom body (Doceticism). This opinion afterwards prevailed within the Church, in the so-called monarchian tendency which thought that it could only maintain the unity (monarchy) of the Deity by viewing Christ as a mere influence or indwelling of the Spirit of God, and which culminated in the doctrine of Arius (a presbyter at Alexandria during the times of his great opponent Athanasius), according to which Christ was a kind of intermediate being, produced by God before the creation of the world, for the purpose of effecting this act. After these errors had been rejected (the latter at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325), the question was to solve the more difficult problem of making the unity of the two natures in the God-man comprehensible. Here, also, two views opposed to each other had to be encountered; the one, the system of sober and distinguishing reason, incapable of conceiving any but an external union of the two natures, and viewing the Godhead of Christ as dwelling in the manhood, as it were, in a temple, since otherwise, it was thought that the truth of the human nature and the necessary distinction between the Divine and human were violated. Such views, adopted by the Antiochian school, were taught by Nestorius, from whom they derived the name Nestorianism. The other was that of speculative reason (the Alexandrian theology), which, seeking to give due emphasis to the unity of the two



natures, incurred the danger of sinking the human in the Divine. This system, advocated by Eutyches in Constantinople, was called Monophysitism, *i.e.*, the doctrine of one nature from the mingling of the two. In opposition to both these contrasted views, the abiding distinction of the two natures, and their union in the central point of the personal life, was laid down at the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, by the influence of the Romish bishop Leo. But even this did not satisfy the demands of Christian faith. And it is to the Lutheran doctrine of the God-man that we are indebted for dealing more seriously with the unity of the two natures, which are viewed as not merely united in the personal centre, but as themselves unified, and existing in each other. It must, however, be confessed, that the older Lutheran doctrine gave too great a preponderance to the Divine, as is evident from the fact that it ascribed to Jesus, even during His earthly life, and with regard to the human side of His person, omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence, though the possession of these attributes does not agree with the picture presented by the Gospel history.

(<sup>18</sup>) Jesus, after having been regarded by rationalism as a mere man, though the ideal of virtue and wisdom, is in these days either looked upon as the religious genius (Strauss), or the man of ecclesiastical liberty, and the friend of the oppressed people (Schenkel), or the portrait given of him in the Gospels is disguised by sentimental additions (Renan). Compare my Lectures on the modern views of Jesus ; also, Uhland's *Die modernen Darstellungen des Lebens Jesu*, 4 lectures, 1866 ; and Niemann's *Jesu Sündlosigkeit und heil. Vollkommenheit*, 1866.

(<sup>19</sup>) This idea of renunciation is especially expressed by the Apostle Paul, Phil. ii. 6. The meaning of this passage evidently is, that Christ shared in the Divine glory before He began an earthly life, and that He surrendered this glory in order to enter upon a life of dependence and self-denying service, that He might then, by this road of humilia-



tion, raise himself to the height of equality with God, which He would not seize as plunder, but receive from the Father as the reward of His obedience. The notion of a renunciation, to a certain degree, of the Divine nature at the incarnation, has, from the first, prevailed in the Church, though it has never been clearly seen how far this was to be extended. A just hesitation was felt to extend it to the divine nature in Christ, because of the unchangeableness of God (*in deum nulla cadit mutatio*), hence such a self-limitation as is involved in the fact that the Son entered into human nature was the point usually stopped at. This notion is also expressed in those Christmas hymns, which place side by side the sharp contrasts found combined in Jesus Christ, as, *e.g.*, in the mediæval hymn—

*Altitudo, quid hic jaces  
In tam vili stabulo  
Qui creasti coeli faces  
Alges in praesepio.*

*O quam mira perpetrasti  
Jesu, propter hominem  
Tam ardentem quem amasti  
Paradiso exulem.*

*Firmitudo infirmatur  
Parva fit immensitas,  
Laboratur, alligatur  
Nascitur aeternitas.*

*O quam mira perpetrasti, etc.*

Or in Luther's well-known Christmas song: *Gelobet seist du Jesu Christ, &c.*—

*In unser armes Fleisch und Blut  
Verkleidet sich das höchste Gut.\**

In scientific theology, however, the matter assumed this form. Starting from the twofold supposition that the Divine nature is unchangeable, and that the attributes of omnipotence, &c., pertain to this nature; the human nature was in the incarnation, by reason of its union with the Divine, allowed to participate in these attributes; with this reservation, that the human nature, in the state of humiliation, was to be conceived of as indeed possessing, but not fully exercising

\* The supreme good is disguised in our poor flesh and blood.

them, such exercise being the part of the Divine nature only. Thus was it attempted both to preserve the unity and to leave room for the human development, as well as for the earthly and human existence of Jesus. This theory, however, offers a two-fold difficulty. For, first, the unity of the two natures seems not fully carried out, if the exercise of the Divine attributes is conceded only to the Divine, and not also to the human nature, the Divine being in this exercise conceived of as exterior to the human nature. And, secondly, this distinction between possession and exercise can be hardly carried out in some of the attributes, *e.g.*, omniscience. It is said, Mark xiii. 32, that even the Son knows not the day of the judgment, and this saying seems to militate even against the possession of omniscience, and that not only on the part of Christ's human, but also of His Divine nature during His state of renunciation and humiliation upon earth. Hence more recent theologians seek to escape this difficulty by extending the renunciation to the Divine side also, without the latter being changed in its proper nature. Thomasius especially (*Christi Person und Werk*, ii., 2nd edition, 1857), endeavours, with much energy, to assert and carry out such extension, by distinguishing between such attributes as belong to the proper nature of God, and are inalienable, and such as belong to God's relation to the world—such as omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience. These Christ renounced when He became man. It is true that this attempt has encountered decided opposition from other orthodox theologians, especially Philippi, in his *Kirchl. Glaubenslehre*, iv. 1, 306, sq. But though the statements of Thomasius may need much revision, he has yet struck out the right path. It would perhaps be better not to speak of the attributes of Christ, but of His position with respect to the world. This was changed at His incarnation. It was not during His earthly life, one of absolute sovereignty. Christ remained, according to His nature, the Lord of the world; and when this is said, everything essential and eternally befitting Him in His position with respect to the world is saved and preserved. But His historical position was a different one, and His

power was determined by the limits of His office. The relation of God to the world is that of power and love ; but the power of God is at the service of His love, and is meted to the measure of love. Thus the power of God limited itself, even at the creation, with respect to the free self-determination with which the love of God endowed human personality. Now the incarnation of the Son of God being the supreme act of love, the deepest descent into fellowship with us, is therefore also the utmost possible self-limitations of the Divine sovereignty with respect to the world, in the service of the Divine counsel of love, and its execution in history. In this His office of love to the world, the power of Christ was saved and reserved, and was, at the proper time, again displayed in His exaltation, but then as historical reality in His position towards the world. Hence we may say that, for the period of His earthly life, Christ renounced, not only on the part of His human, but also His Divine nature, the actual sovereignty of the world, in the service, and for the purpose of His office of love towards the world, until, at His exaltation, His office again required this sovereignty for the purpose of appropriating to the world that which He had earned for it by loving service.

(<sup>20</sup>) *Tertullian advers. Marcion*, ii, 17 : ‘ Is then the incarnation unworthy of God ? It is in the highest degree worthy of God. For nothing is so worthy of God as our salvation.’ In these words is implied the notion that it is only by beginning with the incarnate Christ that we can rightly know God, inasmuch as the incarnation of Christ manifests that not power but love is the highest and deepest quality in God.

(<sup>21</sup>) There was a time when efforts were made to get over the miracles of the Bible by explaining them, as it was said, in a natural manner. Paulus of Heidelberg especially sought his laurels in such efforts during the first decades of the present century. This was, however, the most unnatural explanation possible, and only excited ridicule. The wise men of the East, *e.g.*, were said to be travelling merchants ;

the transfiguration of Christ, a storm ; the miracle at the marriage at Cana, a marriage joke ; the healing of the man born blind, the salutary effect of the moist cool earth upon an inflamed eye, etc. But this folly has not even yet died out, though the progress of education has (especially since Strauss) exchanged such outrages for the myth and imagination theory. Hence the Gospel history is now to be regarded as a fiction of the Christian Church (Strauss). But, then, whose work is this Church itself? Is it not the most primitive conviction of the Church, that what she is, she is through Christ? This effect requires an adequate cause. Hence the appearance of Jesus Christ must have been a most powerfully efficient cause ; and of this appearance, according to the conviction of the Christian Church, His miracles formed a part. Compare 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lect. X., p. 278.

---

#### NOTES TO LECTURE V.

(<sup>1</sup>) The inculcation of the three offices of Christ is of great antiquity in the Church, and prevailed also in the doctrinal teaching of our Church, until Ernesti (of Leipsic) rejected it as merely figurative language. Schleiermacher, however, again brought it into acceptance. And justly so, for it corresponds with the three great eras of Israel's history : the post-Mosaic, in which the high priest, the Davidic, in which the king, and the later period, in which the prophet, formed the central point of the nation, and was the organ of God.

(<sup>2</sup>) Attempts have recently been made to explain the development of Christ by extending the period during which His ideas were developing beyond His baptism and into His ministry. This view is advocated even by Keim, *Der Geschichtl. Christus.*, 1865, although Christ's baptism was itself the assumption of His Messianic office. His Messianic consciousness, however, presupposes his consciousness of Sonship, and not *vice versa* ; for it was in the nature of things that He should first be conscious of Himself, of His

person, and of His personal relation to God, and afterwards, and by reason of this, of His office. The narrative of His visit, in His twelfth year, to the Temple at Jerusalem, makes this sufficiently clear. It is true that Jesus did not from the very first, but only gradually, bear testimony to His Messiahship; but it is equally so that this was on paedagogic grounds, and not because He did not at first feel and know Himself to be the Messiah. For this testimony and faith therein had certain moral and religious presuppositions, unless it were to be a faith on mere authority, and destitute of moral worth. The person and teaching of Jesus must first have made an impression before this testimony could be rightly understood and received. The disciples had reached this stage, Matt. xvi. 16; and the reason that Jesus so greatly rejoiced was, that their confession of His Messiahship was not an opinion externally accepted, but the mature fruit of their own inward development. If then—as is evident—Jesus raised His disciples to His own level, He must first Himself have stood upon that height of knowledge to which He sought, by slow and patient labour, to elevate them. This was the case, also, with His consciousness of His approaching passion, which did not become evident to Him for the first time when He spoke of it (Matt. xxi. 21, etc.), but which He then spoke of because His disciples were then able to bear this saying.

(<sup>3</sup>) The period before His baptism was to the Lord Jesus the period of His development; that subsequent to it, the period of His ministry. When He went to His baptism His inner development was complete; He was certain both of His person and His office. Hence, His baptism was both a declaration on His part of His willingness to undertake His office, and a Divine preparation for it (Acts x. 38). Strauss and others have asked how this narrative of His endowment with the Holy Ghost is to be reconciled with that of His conception by the Holy Ghost, and have concluded that the former represented the original view, while the latter was, on the contrary, a legend subsequently formed; that if Jesus had been conceived by the Holy Ghost, He



already possessed Him, and did not need the reception of Him at His baptism ; and therefore that, if the latter took place, this is equivalent to a denial of the former. But all this rests upon a misconception of the diversities of the Holy Spirit's operations, both in the case of the Lord Jesus and of each individual believer. It is one operation of the Holy Ghost which renews our hearts, and makes us new men, and another which endows us with gifts and powers for the efficient service of God. The former is His work of regeneration ; the latter, of bestowing gifts and graces. That makes us children of God ; this makes us His servants. The one effects our personal communion with God ; the other makes us fellow-workers with God. In both instances it is one and the same Spirit, but in distinct and varying operations ; and the former does not necessarily involve the latter, as, on the other hand, the latter may exist independently of the former (Matt. vii. 22 ; 1 Cor. xlii. 1, 2)—*Tha temptation* of Christ cannot be looked upon as a merely internal occurrence, since in this case the spotless mirror of Christ's soul would have been clouded by the sinful thoughts thus made to arise from His heart. Hence it is a transaction between Jesus and the tempter,—though not to be understood in so material and literal a manner as the conversation and intercourse of two human beings ; for such representations of the invisible world to the senses as we here meet with can only be appreciated by those for whom they are intended. This occurrence is unique in history, for the revelation of God in Christ is also unique in history. It is, moreover, decisive with regard to the execution of God's plan of salvation, and the ancient antagonism between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness. The importance of the event evidently consists in the fact that it was an attempt to seduce Jesus into the path of those carnal and earthly Messianic notions which existed in the imaginations of the people, an attempt frequently renewed during the ministry of Jesus. (Compare, *e.g.*, John vi. 15.) The whole period of forty days, during which Jesus was wholly absorbed by His spirit's tendency towards God, and withdrawn from bodily wants, was a time of temptation.



The three temptations of which we possess a narrative, form the close of this period of temptation, when Jesus returned to a state of consciousness to sensuous impressions, and therewith to the feeling of bodily wants. The first temptation concerned the misuse of the miraculous powers bestowed upon Him, for the arbitrary supply of His own temporal necessities, instead of for the service of His Messianic office; the second, the abuse of the mighty protection of God for self-chosen glorification before the people; the third, a premature assumption of His future dominion over the world, in direct opposition to His office, instead of receiving it from the hand of God upon the path of suffering. It is significant that Jesus, in spite of the misuse of Scripture by the enemy, was not deterred from using it as the lawful weapon and decisive rule of conduct.

(<sup>4</sup>) Uhland 'To the Unseen.'

*Du den wir suchen auf so finstern Wegen  
Mit forschenden Gedanken nicht erfassen  
Du hast dein heilig Dunkel einst erlassen  
Und tratest sichtbar deinem Volk entgegen.*

*Welch süßes Heil, dein Bild sich einzuprägen  
Die Worte deines Mundes aufzufassen!  
O selig, die an deinem Mahle sassen!  
O selig, der an deiner Brust gelegen!*

*Drum war es auch kein seltsames Gelüste  
Wenn Pilger ohne Zahl vom Strande stiessen  
Wenn Heere kämpften an der fernsten Küste.  
Nur um an deinem Fraue noch zu heten  
Und um in frommer Inbrunst noch zu küssen  
Die heilige Erde die dein Füß betreten.*

(Thou—whom we seek in ways so dark, whom we cannot with all our researches comprehend—Thou didst once leave thy sacred obscurity and appear visibly to Thy people.

What a precious blessing, to have had thine image impressed upon (the mind), to have taken in the words of Thy mouth. Oh happy they who sat at table with thee, Oh happy he who leant upon Thy breast.

It was no strange fancy that innumerable pilgrims should launch on the deep, that armies should contend on distant

coasts only for the sake of praying at thy sepulchre, and kissing with heartfelt devotion the holy soil trodden by thy feet).

Some lines, too, of Schenkendorf's poem 'Sehnsucht' may also be added—

*Act, das war ein schöner Segen  
Wenn er mit den Jungern ging  
Auf den Feldern, auf den Wegen  
Jedes Herz wie Maienregen  
Seinen Trost sein Wort empfang.*

(Ah it was a great happiness when He went in the fields and by the way with His disciples—every heart received His comforting words like rain in May).

(<sup>5</sup>) So, also, Pressensé, *Jesus Christ*, etc., p. 291.

(<sup>6</sup>) An excellent section on the universality of sacrifice may be found in Nicolas ii. 52, etc., where also Voltaire's saying (*Essai sur les Mœurs*, chap. 70), is quoted: 'Among so many different religions there is none whose main object has not been propitiation. Man has ever felt that he needed pardon.'

(<sup>7</sup>) Comp. Virgil Aen. V. 815: *Unum pro multis dabitur caput*. On human sacrifice in a substitutionary sense among the Greeks, compare Nägelsbach *Nachhomer. Theologie*, 1857, v. 5 and 6, p. 195, etc., and vi. 19, p. 355, etc.

(<sup>8</sup>) The first attempt to prove the necessity of an atonement by the God-man, in the way of suffering, was made by the great theologian Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, in his work, *Cur Deus Homo*: (Why did God become man?) It is man who must suffer for sin and for the offence done to God by sin, while yet he is incapable of offering an adequate, because an infinite, satisfaction for this infinite offence, which God alone can do; hence it is the act of the God-man, and that by His voluntary death, which is a full, perfect, and sufficient satisfaction for this guilt, and is therefore our comfort in death. This view of the subject became and remained, on the whole, that of the Church, being in

all essential matters that which is founded on Scripture. (Compare, *e.g.*, 2 Cor. v. 21.) On the other hand, the denial of the need of atonement originated with the Socinians, and passed from them to the rationalists, a summary of whose objections is given by Philippi, in his *Kirchl. Glaubenslehre*, iv. 2, 158, etc. The doctrine of the atonement, as held by the older divines of our Church, is essentially as follows: 1. Sin is an offence against the Triune God. 2. This offence God must punish; to leave it unpunished and forgive it unconditionally, would be at variance with both God's justice and truth. 3. Its fitting punishment would be eternal death, the perdition of men. This would satisfy the justice of God, but not His love. Hence the wisdom of God found an expedient by which satisfaction was rendered, first to His justice and then also to His love. This satisfaction was rendered by the God-man, whose acts and sufferings are of infinite worth because He is God, and avail for us because He is man. 5. His intervention comprises both His active and passive obedience. By His active obedience He fulfilled in our stead the law which we had not fulfilled; by His passive obedience He suffered in our stead the punishment of the law which we had incurred—suffered it not partially but entirely, and therefore endured, though not eternally, even the torments of hell and perdition, or eternal death. Thus He made satisfaction to the Divine justice. 6. The effect of this satisfaction is the merit of Christ, which the love of God then makes over and imputes to us. Against this theory the Socinians objected—1. That substitutionary punishment was not *necessary*, because God could, of His own kindness, forgive as well as men can. To which it may be replied that the freedom of God is not inclination, but that it is bound to the moral law of His own nature, which God cannot deny. 2. They oppose the *possibility* of substitutionary penal suffering. For, first: Forgiveness of sin and satisfaction exclude each other; if God is paid by punishment, there is no need for Him to forgive. This objection, however, though it holds good in the sphere of facts, *e.g.*, with regard to money debts, etc.,

does not hold good in the sphere of morals with regard to moral debts. Then : It is unjust to make the innocent suffer in the place of the guilty, and impossible to make over the sin and guilt of one to another. These objections are obviated by the idea of substitution or representation, as it frequently occurs even in human relations. Jesus Christ, moreover, does not stand in an incidental relation to human nature, but comprises it in Himself as its head and representative ; He is the Son of Man. 3. They object to the *reality* of substitutionary penal suffering, that Christ did not really suffer the punishment of all men and eternal death, for He rose from the dead. Christ, however, did suffer death, which is the wages of sin. And, finally—4. They object to the moral results of this doctrine ; for if Christ has already obeyed the law for us, we need not fulfil it ourselves. This, however, is an utterly external kind of view, which misconceives the fact that in this case we have to deal with inward relations and moral transactions. Rationalism then went beyond Socinianism, attacking Church doctrine as one which made God ‘a blood-thirsty Moloch,’ and affirming that the death of Christ was only the death of a martyr for his testimony to truth. Recent theology, which has more or less decidedly returned to Church doctrine, lays greater emphasis on the personal and moral element in Christ’s sufferings than was done by the older divines, and therefore regards them more as expiatory than as penal. The question is, not to prove that Christ actually suffered that hell and perdition which we must have suffered in the future—a proof which would be attended by some difficulty, because the bond of communion between the Father and the Son was never wholly dissolved, not even on the Cross, and hence Christ was never rejected and condemned by God in the full and proper sense of the words, but was, on the contrary, ever assured by faith of God’s love and united therewith—but the chief matter of all is that Christ, of His own free will, took upon Himself the penal consequences of sin, which He suffered by death, and thus made them His personal act and deed, which, He being our representative, holds good for us.

(<sup>9</sup>) On the moral nature of God, and on the moral system of the world as conditioned thereby, comp. Delitzsch *System der christl. Apologetik*, p. 178 sq., 'God is just. The punishment of sin, which makes itself felt in a thousand forms, both in and around us, proves this. The pangs which our conscience suffers, as the consequence of sin—the afflictions of mind, body, or circumstances by which sin is punished—death, to which all around us, and at length we ourselves, succumb with all the sorrow which precedes and follows it—the Nemesis which presides over the world's history, and visits the sins of fathers upon children and children's children, excluding all notion of chance—all this testifies to us that God is the Just One. He governs and judges according to the rule of supreme justice. For there is a moral system of the world, not ordained by a Divine arbitrariness which might have ordered it otherwise, but a system which a moral will, corresponding with the goodness of God, and therefore necessary and unchangeable, absolutely conditions and disposes.' Comp. also Stahl, (*Fundam. einer christliche Philosophie*, 1846, p. 141, etc.) on Justice as the idea of the moral world as such, i.e., the idea upon which its stability and preservation depend, and on its basis in the Supreme Personality, who unchangeably wills His own will. The opposite view is expressed in the notions advocated by mediaeval teachers, and subsequently by Socinians, according to which the will of God is identified with arbitrariness, and His freedom regarded as in opposition to necessity, instead of in accordance with inward necessity.

(<sup>10</sup>) The distinction between atonement and punishment, in opposition to their identification by our older dogmatists, has been well and clearly laid down by Stahl, *Fundamente einer christl. Philosophie* 1846, p. 156, etc. Atonement is an ethical punishment, a judicial notion; the former presupposes an innocent, the latter a guilty person, the former must be voluntarily undertaken, the latter need only be endured; the former satisfies the moral consciousness, the latter the sense of justice; the former restores the moral fellowship, the latter separates therefrom; hence the



former is done away with in the very act of its consummation, the latter is by its nature abiding.

(<sup>11</sup>) When Moses resolved (Exod. xxxii.) "I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sins," and professed his willingness that his name should be blotted out of the book of the Lord, he was seeking to save the people by offering himself to the anger of God. "All those men of God who, like Elijah and Jeremiah, were consumed by the ardour of their wrath against, and love for their people, were in this respect types of Him who took upon His heart and conscience the sin of His whole nation and of all mankind, that by so doing His death might make an atonement for them." Delitzsch *Apol.*, p. 405.—Nor was the idea of substitution alien to heathen antiquity. Compare Nägelsbach *Nachhomer. Theol.*, p. 29-34, 194-200, 343, 353.—The notion of a substitution is found in Æschylus's legend of Prometheus (Prometheus Bound, v. 1026 sq.): 'Hope not for an end to such oppression until a god appears as thy substitute in torment, ready to descend for thee into the sunless realm of Hades, and the dark abyss of Tartarus:' (compare 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture VIII., 209), also in Sophocles' *Œdipus in Colonus*, v. 498: 'For one soul, I think, would suffice to effect this, even for thousands, if it approaches with a pure mind.' On which passage Wilhelm Henke, in his clever brochure on the *Œdipus* of Sophocles, p. 23, remarks: 'They who would find in these two lines a touch of Messianic prediction, need no allegorical explanation to help them.' That only a pure soul is capable of effecting an atonement for a guilt-laden family and race, is the beautiful thought upon which Goethe's *Iphigenia in Tauris* is founded:

‘*Soll dieser Fluch denn ewig walten? Soll  
Nie diess Geschlecht mit neuem Segen  
Sich wieder heben?  
So hofft' ich denn vergebens, hier verwahrt,  
Von meines Hauses Schicksal abgeschieden,  
Dereinst mit reiner Hand und reinem Herzen  
Die schwer befleckte Wohnung zu entschütten*’ (iv. 5).



(Is, then, this curse to last for ever? Is this race never to rise up again with a new blessing? Then have I hoped in vain, kept here apart from the fate of my family, to make, one day, with pure hand and heart, an atonement for my deeply stained home.)

(<sup>12</sup>) Certain facts of ancient history, such as the self-sacrifice of Codrus at Athens, or of Curtius, at Rome, are, in some sense, examples of such passive and active substitution. Compare also Stahl, *Fundamente*, etc., p. 157, on the idea of atonement in the death of Antigone, as well as in other historical events.

(<sup>13</sup>) Compare Kritzler: *Humanität und Christenthum*, 1866, i. p. 87.

(<sup>14</sup>) Compare a series of passages in Pascal, ii. 338, etc.: ‘*Le mystère de Jésus: Jésus cherche quelque consolation au moins dans ses trois plus chers amis, et ils dorment, etc. Jésus est seul dans la terre, non seulement qui ressent et partage sa peine, mais qui la cherche, le ciel et lui sont seuls dans cette connaissance. Il souffre cette peine et cet abandon dans l’horreur de la nuit.*’ And farther on, p. 314, where Pascal touchingly sums up in a few words all the tragic circumstances in the life of Jesus: ‘*De trente-trois ans, il en vit trente sans paraître. Dans trois ans il passe pour un imposteur; les prêtres et les principaux le rejettent; ses amis et ses plus proches le méprisent. Enfin il meurt trahi par un des siens, renié par l’autre et abandonné par tous.*’

(<sup>15</sup>) Compare, on this subject, Pascal, ii. 323: ‘*Qui a appris aux évangélistes les qualités d’une âme parfaitement héroïque, pour la peindre si parfaitement en Jésus Christ? Pourquoi le font ils faible dans son agonie? Ne savent ils pas peindre une mort constante? Oui, car le même saint Luc peint celle de saint Etienne plus forte que celle de Jésus Christ. Ils le font donc capable de crainte avant que la nécessité de mourir soit arrivée, et ensuite tout fort. Mais*

*quand ils le font si troublé, c'est quand il se trouble lui même, et quand les hommes le troublent il est tout fort.'*

(16) According to Pressensé, p. 290. On the alteration in Jesus before and after His inward victory over the fear that came upon Him, compare Pascal, ii. 323, &c., and 339: '*Jésus prie dans l'incertitude de la volonté du Père et craint la mort; mais l'ayant connue, il va au devant s'offrir à elle: eamus, processit (Johannes).*'

(17) On the punishment of crucifixion in the ancient world, particulars will be found in Herzog's *Theol. Realencycl.* viii. 65, &c. There were two principal forms according to which the cross was constructed, the so-called *crux commissa*, T, and the *crux immissa*, †, the form with which we are familiar. The cross on which Christ was crucified seems to have been the former. This appears from a passage of Tertullian (*adv. Marcion*, iii. 22; *ipsa est enim litera Graecorum Tau nostra autem T, species crucis*), from various crosses in the ancient catacombs, and finally, from the caricature-crucifix of the beginning of the third century, which was discovered among the ruins of the palace of the Caesars on the Palatine. Compare the next note. Crucifixion itself was probably derived by the Romans from the Carthaginians and Phoenicians. It was very extensively employed by the former during the Servile War and at the conquest of Jerusalem. It was esteemed the most terrible punishment (*Cic. crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium*), and a degradation (*servile supplicium*) to which only slaves and the worst of criminals, but never Roman citizens, were subjected. A stupefying potion was, according to Jewish, but not according to Roman custom, first administered to those condemned to it. (This was offered to Jesus also, Matt. xxvii. 34, but rejected by Him, because He desired to suffer and die in full possession of consciousness.) The criminal was then drawn up with ropes by the four soldiers charged, according to custom, with the execution, and seated upon the *sedile* (a peg in the middle of the long beam to support the weight of the body). The arms and legs were then firmly bound, and

strong nails driven through the hands, and also through the feet, which usually rested on a foot-board (the *suppedaneum*). The tortures of crucifixion were produced, 1, by the unnatural extension and sameness of position, by the slightest motion, especially of the lacerated back—crucifixion being generally preceded by scourging—and by the nails; 2, many nerves and sinews being torn and pressed upon by the nails, great anguish must have been the result; 3, the wounds became inflamed, the flow of blood being checked by its coagulation, and gangrene thus formed, which stopped the circulation, and produced violent pain and unendurable thirst; 4, the blood, finding no room in the outstretched limbs, rushed to the head and chest, causing terrible pains in the head, and much internal congestion and agony. Torpidity and exhaustion came on gradually. It not unfrequently happened that birds of prey lighted upon the bodies of the crucified while still alive, picking out their eyes, &c., without their being able to defend themselves; or that wild beasts devoured them. Crucified criminals did not generally live more than twelve hours, though they sometimes suffered till the third day. The Jewish historian Josephus tells us of certain who were at his intercession taken down from the cross before death, and whose lives were saved by the most assiduous care and attention. It is evident that this punishment was a combination of the severest torments which a refinement of cruelty could invent. Zestermann began the delivery of a very thorough and interesting discussion on the sign of the Cross, as the programme of the *Thomasschule* at Leipsic, Easter 1867. The Pictorial Representation of the Cross and the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ historically developed. Div. I.—The Cross before Christ.

(<sup>18</sup>) The particulars will be found in the interesting work of Fred Becker: *Das Spottcrucifix der römischen Kaiserpaläste aus dem Anfang des 3 Jahrh.* 1866; the chief matter of which is contained also in a second work of the same writer: *Die Darstellung Jesu Christi unter dem Bild des Fisches auf den Monumenten der Kirche der Katakomben*, 1866.

## NOTES TO LECTURE VI.

(<sup>1</sup>) On the question of Christ's resurrection, compare 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture VII., p. 202. Holsten openly asserts (see the articles cited in the *Protest. Kirchenzeitung*, 1862, April and May), that criticism *must* explain everything according to historical, *i.e.*, to natural principles, and, hence, *cannot but* deny the miracle of the resurrection; that so fatal an inconsistency must not and cannot be attributed to modern consciousness, as the reception of this fact would involve; and believes he can account for the faith of the disciples in the resurrection by the hypothesis that the disciples found the grave empty because Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, who were no disciples! had removed the body to another place, which remained unknown. In short, in the case of all modern deniers of the fact of the resurrection, we find that either doctrinal or philosophic assumptions form the motive or furnish the necessity for denial. Zeller, in his *Vorträgen und Abhandlungen geschichtlichen Inhalts* (1865, p. 491), unreservedly declares, that he and those like-minded with him could not possibly believe in the reality of such an event as the resurrection of Christ, 'however strong might be the testimony thereto.'

(<sup>2</sup>) According to the unquestionable account of Holy Scripture, the place of Christ's crucifixion, as well as the not distant sepulchre, was outside the city (Mark xv. 20, John xix. 17, 20, Heb. xiii. 12, 13) while the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which also includes Golgotha, stands within. Helena, the mother of Constantine, ascertained the spot, guided not only by existing Christian tradition, but also by diligent enquiries especially among the Jews, and three crosses being found here, Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem—so says the Legend—verified the cross of Christ by healing therewith 'a dying man after having in vain touched him with the crosses of the two thieves. Eusebius declares that over the Holy Sepulchre had been erected a temple of Venus, which was razed by Constantine, and a mortuary church erected in its stead, begun A.D. 326, and com-

pleted A.D. 336. According to an ancient retrospective legend Adam is said to have been buried at the spot on which the crucifixion took place. On the genuineness of this Holy place investigators are divided, but the balance of probability is in its favour. So much the more is it to be regretted that this holiest spot of Christendom should be desecrated by the unworthy scenes which notoriously occur every Easter eve.

(<sup>3</sup>) Negotiations on this matter have, since the old rationalistic explanation of a trance could not be saved, even by Schleiermacher, been all concentrated on the question, whether we have here to do with a vision or an external and actual fact. Compare Güder's *Apologetischen Beweisführungen*; Beyschlag's *Die Auferstehung Christi* in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1864, ii.; Gebhardt's *Die Auferstehung Christi und ihre neuesten Gegner*, 1864; and Stutz, *Vorträge*, p. 146, etc. Mosheim had already sufficiently refuted the vision hypothesis. Compare *Beweis des Glaubens*, 1867, i., p. 23.

(<sup>4</sup>) So Holsten, in the above mentioned articles, in opposition to which Beyschlag brings forward all needful considerations, and directs attention to the fact that St Paul makes a very clear distinction between actual appearances like that near Damascus, and visions (as in 2 Cor. xii.)

(<sup>5</sup>) So also Keim, *Geschichtl. Christus*, p. 133.

(<sup>6</sup>) It is fundamentally, Schleiermacher's view, that a vital influence proceeded from the personality of Christ, filled as it was with Divinity; that this influence, continuing within the Church, is experienced by every individual who enters its communion. From the fact of this experience, he argues as from an effect to its cause, and demands and constructs therefrom the historical fact of Christ's person; but the relation in which he makes Christ stand to the Christian is not that present and direct one which is unmistakably represented in Scripture to have been the conviction of the Apostolic Church. Compare also my Sermons, vol. iii., *Das Wort der Wahrheit*, 1866, p. 16.



(<sup>7</sup>) The Holy Ghost, in the sense of His New Testament agency, was, both according to John vii. 3, 9, and to the promises of the departing Saviour to His disciples (John xiv. 16, and elsewhere), as also to the consciousness of the apostles (*e.g.*, 1 John iii. 24), something absolutely new; for since He is the power by which redemption is appropriated, and the bond of communion with God, it was necessary that redemption itself should be effected, and communion with God restored by the death, resurrection, and glorification of Jesus, before the Holy Ghost could appropriate this new salvation. Since, then, the possession of the Holy Spirit is the characteristic of Christians, it is He who makes the Christian a Christian, Rom. viii. 9.

(<sup>8</sup>) Compare Delitzsch *Apol.*, p. 262 sq., and Hegel in the preface to the 2d edit. of his *Encyclopædia*.

(<sup>9</sup>) Hegel *Religions Philosophie*, ii., note 188.

(<sup>10</sup>) What Cicero tells us of the poet Simonides is interesting. When questioned concerning the nature of God, he always requested more time for his answer, because the more deeply he examined the matter, the more obscure did it appear (*De Nat. Deor.*, i., 21: *Simonides ab Hierone Syracusarum tyranno interrogatus, quid aut qualis sit deus, deliberandi causa sibi unum diem, inde biduum postulavit. At quum saepius dierum numerum duplicasset, admiranti cur id faceret Hieroni; quia quanto, respondit, diutius considero, tanto mihi res videtur obscurior*).

(<sup>11</sup>) The words of Nicolas, iii. 83.

(<sup>12</sup>) This comparison was originally used by the Romish Bishop Gregory the Great, who, in a letter to Leander, Archbishop of Seville, uses these words when speaking of Holy Scripture.

(<sup>13</sup>) Compare Delitzsch *Apol.*, p. 286, and his appeal to Bähr's *Symbolik des mosaischen Kultus* (1837).



(<sup>14</sup>) In connexion with the Old Testament passages on Wisdom, Job xxviii. 13, &c. ; Prov. viii. 22 (compare Wisd. vii. 25), in which the Church has at all times found allusions to the Trinity (see even Philippi's *Kirchl. Glaubenslehre*, ii. 192), and the Old Testament statements concerning the Word, a theory of the Logos (*i.e.*, word or reason), a kind of intermediate impersonal being, and the organ of all Divine revelation, whether natural or spiritual, was formed, especially in the Alexandrine philosophy of religion, and, above all, by Philo, a contemporary of our Lord and His apostles. Compare Kahnis, *Dogmatik*, i. 316, &c., where also the literature of this subject is adduced. But this prae-Christian speculation was no more a preparation for, or precursor of the New Testament doctrine of the Trinity than was the son of God in Plato's *Timäus*. They are mere abstractions, and not realities. 'The Christian doctrine of one God in three centres of manifestation, which each by itself manifests the whole Godhead, did not originate in a purely metaphysical manner, but was developed from a belief in the facts of the manifestation' (Martensen, *Dogmatik*, p. 96, &c.). Still less has it anything in common with the supposed traces of Trinitarianism found in heathen religions, as in the Indian Trimurti. These are founded on entirely different notions, and are symbolic forms of the process of natural life. They are only worthy of mention, in so far as they exemplify that law of the human mind, its tendency to think of the process of life exclusively in a triple manner.

(<sup>15</sup>) Compare Tholuck *Ssufismus sive theosophia Persarum pantheistica*, 1821. *Blüthensammlung aus der morgenländische Mystik*, 1825.

(<sup>16</sup>) Traces (*vestigia*) of Trinity have from of old been sought in nature (*e.g.*, sun, ray, light) ; but a resemblance thereto, though but a very remote one (*imago non aequalis, imo valde longeque distans*, August *De civ. Dei*, xi. 26 ; *De trin.*, xv. 22), has been found only in man ; Augustine, indeed, was the first to strike out this path. He pointed out an image of the Trinity in the elements of man's nature :

Being (*esse* or consciousness, *memoria*), knowledge (*nosse*), will (*velle*); Compare *Confess.* xiii. 11 ; *De civ. Dei* xi. 26, 27 ; *memoria, intellectus, voluntas De trin.* xv., 21, 22. The will is, however, more profoundly defined by him as love, as *dilectio, caritas : numquid est aliud caritas quam voluntas ?* Thus, then, the Trinitarian process is an inward mutual knowledge and will on the part of God. Or he obtains from the very idea of love, which involves self-knowledge as its postulate, the inward self-distinction of God : *amans, amatus, mutus amor.*, *De trin.*, viii. 10 ; ix. 2. Subsequent Church teachers followed in the steps of Augustine. The first mode of explanation became the usual one in the Church ; the other, that which prevailed among the mystics. In the Reformation era, Melancthon attempted to transfer this explanation into the Protestant system of doctrine : ‘The Son is the self-thought of the Father, the Holy Ghost the loving will of both (*Pater æternus sese intuens gignit cogitationem sui, quæ est imago ipsius non evanescens, sed subsistens communicata ipsi essentia. Hæc imago est secunda persona. Dicitur λόγος quia cogitatione generatur, dicitur imago, quia cogitatio est imago rei cogitatæ. Ut autem filius nascitur cogitatione, ita spiritus sanctus procedit a voluntate patris et filii ; voluntatis est enim diligere —Pater filium vult et amat eum, ac vicissim filius intuens patrem vult et amat eum ; hoc mutuo amore, qui proprie est voluntatem, procedit spiritus sanctus*). Moderns have sought, partly by the idea of self-consciousness, partly by that of love, to attain to that of the Trinity. Lessing took the first course in a very interesting treatise : *Das Christenthum der Vernunft* (Works by Lachmann, xi. 604–607). ‘God, the all-perfect,’ continues Lessing here, ‘from all eternity, thought Himself, and could think nothing else’ (as Aristot., *Metamorph.* vii. 9, also says : ‘The Divine Spirit can think nothing else than Himself ; for all else is inferior, is less than Himself ; hence, if He thought anything else, He would think what is inferior, which is impossible’). Now idea, will, action, is with God one and the same. God can think of Himself in two manners ; either as all perfections at once, or as these perfections separated.

The former self-thought of God is the eternal Son. If we think of God, we think of Him together with the latter, because we cannot think of God apart from His idea of Himself; He is God's image, but an identical image. Now, between two things which have all qualities in common, *i.e.*, which are but one, there is the greatest harmony. And this is the case here. The harmony between these two is called the Spirit. In this harmony is all that is in the Father and in the Son; it, therefore, is God. None can be without the other; all three are one. The other manner of the Divine thought is that in which God thinks of His perfections as separated, *i.e.*, creates beings of which each has somewhat of His perfections. These together form the world, etc."—To rise to the idea of Trinity from the idea of self-consciousness, and of its subjective process, became customary through the influence of the Hegelian philosophy. Among modern divines, Twisten especially (*Dogmatik* ii, 1, 194 sq.), has taken this road; a road, however, by which we can never succeed in attaining to the personality of the third Divine Person, the Holy Ghost; not even by such profound philosophic efforts as those made by Weissenborn in his lectures on Pantheism and Theism, 1859, p. 184, etc. Beginning with love, and following in the steps of Augustine, Sartorius (*Die Lehre v. d. heil. Liebe*, i), among others, has sought in an interesting manner to attain to the Trinity. But little as these attempts are capable of affording actual support to faith in the Trinity of God, they yet show that an inward process of life and love must be thought of in God, by means of which God is ever causing Himself to exist, and which, by reason of revelation, is known to be a triune one. For it is opposed to Christian consciousness to imagine a stiff unbending monotheism, and a God existing, so to speak, in a state of isolation. This has ever been maintained in the Church. Thus, *e.g.*, Athan. *contra Arian*, ii. 1: The Divine nature would be solitary (*ἐρημος*), like a light that does not shine, like a dried up spring. Hilar. *de trin.*, vii. 3: *Non enim unum deum pie possumus prædicare si solum.* Vinc. Lerin. *Commonit*, c. 17, against Photinus: '*Dicit deum singulum esse et solitarium et more Judaico confiten-*

*dum.*' It is for this very reason that God is self-sufficing and blessed ; otherwise He would be in need of the world. Thus a great defence against pantheism has ever been found in the doctrine of the Trinity ; for the former makes God exist by means of the world, while the God of Christianity has His eternal being in Himself.

(<sup>17</sup>) That God can only be truly and savingly known in Christ, is the constant maxim both of Luther and Pascal. Luther is ever returning to it in his exposition of the xiv., xv., and xvi. chaps. of St John, and of the high-priestly prayer of Jesus. Thus he says, to quote only one passage, on John xvii. 3 : 'Mark how Christ intertwines and unites the knowledge of Himself and of the Father so that the Father can be known only through and in Christ. For I have often said this, and I will say it again, so that even when I am dead it may be remembered, and men may beware of all teachers, as led and guided by the devil, who begin first of all to teach and preach of God alone and apart from Christ,' etc. So, too, he was fond of repeating, that if we would know God we must begin at Christ's manger, unless we would be lost in the labyrinth of the Divine Majesty (*e.g.*, *Opp. lat. Erl.* ii. 170). Melancthon, too, introduces in his *Loci*, 1535, the discussion on the Divine nature, with the remark that he can find no more fitting commencement than the answer of Jesus to Philip, when he desired to see the Father : 'He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father ;' and that we are therefore to seek and to know God in Christ : *Ut discamus deum quærere in Christo, in hoc enim voluit patefieri innotescere et apprehendi* ; for otherwise we shall fall into terrible darkness. Pascal, too, often returns to the thought that, out of Christ, God is a hidden God, and opposes mere deism as much as atheism, etc., *e.g.*, ii. 113, etc. Only the knowledge of God in Christ is also true self-knowledge, p. 115 : '*On peut bien connaître Dieu sans sa misère et sa misère sans Dieu ; mais on ne peut connaître Jésus Christ sans connaître tout ensemble et Dieu et sa misère,—Et c'est pourquoi je n'entreprendrai pas ici de prouver par des raisons naturelles, ou l'existence de Dieu,*

ou la Trinité, ou l'immortalité de l'âme, ni aucune des choses de cette nature—parce que cette connaissance sans Jésus Christ, est inutile et stérile. P. 116 : 'Le dieu des Chrétiens ne consiste pas en un Dieu simplement auteur des vérités géométriques et de l'ordre des éléments; c'est la part des païens et des Epicuriens. Il ne consiste pas seulement en un Dieu qui exerce sa providence sur la vie et sur les biens des hommes; c'est la portion des Juifs. Mais—le Dieu des Chrétiens est un Dieu d'amour et de consolation. C'est un Dieu qui remplit l'âme et le cœur qu'il possède; c'est un Dieu qui leur fait sentir intérieurement leur misère et sa miséricorde infinie,' etc. P. 117 : 'Tous ceux qui cherchent Dieu hors de Jésus Christ et qui s'arrêtent dans la nature, ou ils ne trouvent aucune lumière qui les satisfasse, ou ils arrivent à se former un moyen de connaître Dieu et de le servir sans médiateur; et par là ils tombent ou dans l'athéisme ou dans le déisme qui sont deux choses que la religion Chrétienne abhorre presque également.'—

---

#### NOTES TO LECTURE VII.

(<sup>1</sup>) So Nicolas, iii. 145-147.

(<sup>2</sup>) August. *Enarr*, in *Psalm*. 70, *sermo* 2, § 12, Nicolas, iv. 512, etc.

(<sup>3</sup>) On the reproach of novelty, compare Schaff, *Geschich. der alten Kirche*. 1867, pp. 181, 186. This was one of the reproaches of Celsus, refuted by Origen (*Contra Cels.* vi. p. 329).

(<sup>4</sup>) Pasc. ii. 200 : 'Il est venu enfin en la consommation du temps; et depuis on a vu naître tant de schismes et d'hérésies, tant reverser d'états, tant de changements en toutes choses, et cette église qui adore celui qui a toujours été adoré a subsisté sans interruption. Et ce qui est admirable, incomparable, et tout à fait divin, est que cette religion qui a toujours duré a toujours été combattu. Mille fois elle a été à la veille d'une destruction universelle; et toutes les fois qu'elle



*a été en cet état, Dieu l'a relevée par des coups extraordinaires de sa puissance. C'est ce qui est étonnant, et qu'elle s'est maintenue sans fléchir et plier sous la volonté des tyrans. Les états périssaient, si on ne faisait ployer souvent les lois à la nécessité. Mais jamais la religion n'a souffert cela et n'en a usé.*—

(<sup>5</sup>) Naville, *Der himmlische Vater*, p. 60, adduces a series of works by French scholars (Franck, Edgar Quinet, Benjamin Constant), pointing out the importance of religion as an instrument of civilization.

Buckle, indeed, in his *History of Civilization*, thinks that the Church and religion are a power hostile to and restrictive of progress, Compare, however, on the other side' the *deutsche Vierteljahrschrift*, 1866, No. 115, p. 79. Guizot *cours d'histoire moderne*, Lect. v., on the church: 'She touched on all the great questions in which man is interested; she concerned herself with all the problems of his existence, all the changes of his lot. Hence her influence on modern civilization was very great, greater than either her most violent opponents or most zealous defenders represented.' Montesquieu *Esprit des lois*, xx. 3: 'Strange that the Christian religion whose only object seems to be the happiness of the other world should ensure also the happiness of this.'

(<sup>6</sup>) Excellent works on this subject have been published by certain French authors, in consequence of a prize offered by the French Academy in 1849. Among others by Etienne Chastel: Geneva. *Etudes historiques sur l'influence de la charité durant les premiers siècles Chrétiens, considérations sur son rôle dans les sociétés modernes. Ouvrage couronné en 1852, par l'Académie Française, dans le concours ouvert sur cette question*; and Schmidt, Strasburg, upon the same subject (a work also rewarded by the French Academy): *La société civile dans l'ancien monde Romain, et sa transformation par la Chréienté*, 1857.

(<sup>7</sup>) Compare 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture VI., Note 1., p. 835.

(<sup>8</sup>) *E.g.* v. Schweizer, *Zeitgeist und Christenthum*, 1861



p. 196. Compare 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture I., Note 9, p. 337.

(<sup>9</sup>) Nicolas has a similar train of thought, 3, 283 ; and the paragraph following may also be compared with his work. Pfaff (*Ueber das Wesen und den Umfang der Toleranz im Allgemeinen und der christlichen Toleranz insbesondere*) has some good remarks on toleration.

(<sup>10</sup>) Compare Neander, *Denkw.* i. 39, Schaff *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, p. 147. On the vindication of religious freedom and freedom of conscience, notions then new to the world, by the early Christian apologists, compare Neander, *Denkw.* i. 42, Schaff, p. 148, where various striking passages are cited, especially *Tert. ad Scap.* c 2 : '*Tamen humani juris et naturalis potestatis est unicuique quod putaverit colere, nec alii obest aut prodest alterius religio. Sed nec religionis est cogere religionem, quæ sponte suscipi debeat, non vi.*' *Apolog.* 24 : '*Videte enim ne et hoc ad irreligiositatis elogium concurrat, adimere libertatem religionis et interdicere optionem divinitatis, ut non liceat mihi colere quem velim, sed cogar colere quem nolim. Nemo se ab invito coli volet, ne homo quidem.*' Compare also, Ad. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Denk und Gewissensfreiheit in den ersten Jahrh. der Kaiserherrschaft.* 1847, and the fine passage in Naville, *Der himml. Vater*, p. 68, etc.

(<sup>11</sup>) Compare Naville, *Der himml. Vater*, p. 84 : 'Faith, when it seeks to gain adherents by force, acts in direct antagonism to itself ; the spirit of scepticism need only walk according to the laws of its own nature, to become a spirit of violence.'

(<sup>12</sup>) See Naville, *Der himml. Vater*, p. 73.

(<sup>13</sup>) It was the usual reproach of heathen controversialists *e.g.*, of a Celsus, that Christians consisted chiefly of the lower classes : 'In other mysteries, it was customary for the herald to cry out : Whoso hath clean hands and a good conscience let him enter ! But these cry : If any is a

sinner, a fool, a child, a lost man, he is received into the kingdom of heaven ! We see weavers, shoemakers, tanners, illiterate peasants, men who dare not to open their mouths before men of experience, if they can attract boys and foolish women, relating to them their marvellous tales' (Neander, *Denkw.* i. 21 ; Kritzler, *Die Heldenzeiten des Christenthums*, i. 1856, p. 145).

(<sup>14</sup>) Luther's view of the Church when he dwells on the fact that the Church is an article of faith, and, therefore, by her very nature something chiefly invisible, is agreeable to the meaning of the New Testament (especially in the Pauline and Petrine epistles, Eph. i. 22, etc. ; Col. i. 18 ; Eph. ii. 20-22 ; 1 Peter ii. 9, and other passages), when it designates the Church the spiritual body of Jesus Christ, or the spiritual house of God, or the people of God, and, opposed to Romish doctrine, which understands by the Church the external hierarchically constituted establishment under the authority of the Romish bishop—a corporate body as visible and comprehensible, as Bellarmine says, as the kingdom of France or the republic of Venice. For, continues Luther, 'we say : I believe one holy Catholic Church, now what is believed in is not bodily or visible. If this article is true (viz., *I believe* one holy Catholic Church), it follows that no one can see or feel the holy Catholic Church, nor say, lo here, or lo there it is ! for what we believe we do not see or perceive ; and, again, what we see or perceive we do not believe' (Greater Catechism Works, Erl., edit. xxvii. 303). But she is not only invisible ; she has also a visibility which is of her own nature, and distinct from her empiric visible form and order in the world—and this visibility is the word and Sacraments by which she may be recognised and discovered ; 'for the word of God cannot be without the people of God, nor again the people of God without the word of God.' Hence, the Church is by her nature spiritual, the congregation of believers, the flock which the Holy Ghost has in the world, the people of God in all places and at all times (compare the Greater Catechism). So also does the confession of our Church understand it. Compare *Augsb. Conf.*, Art. vii., and *Apol.*

The Church is, first of all, a spiritual society (*Apol.* p. 144, etc.: *Eccl. non est tantum societas externarum rerum ac rituum sicut alie politicæ sed principaliter est societas fidei et spiritus sancti in cordibus, quæ tamen habet externas notas ut agnosci possit.—Et hæc ecclesia sola dicitur corpus Christi, quod Christus spiritu suo renovat, etc. Quare illi in quibus nihil agit Christus, non sunt membra Christi: Ecclesia est POPULUS SPIRITUALIS, i.e., VERUS POPULUS DEI renatus per spiritum sanctum*). When, then, we speak of an invisible, that is, a spiritual Church, we do not mean that the Church is merely an idea or an ideal—as it certainly has sometimes but erroneously been considered by Protestantism—or nothing more than a pleasant dream. The Protestant confession has, from the very first, expressly refuted such a notion (*Apol.*, p. 148: *Neque vero somniamus nos Platoniam civitatem ut quidam cavillantur, in sed dicimus existere hanc ecclesiam, videlicet vere credentes et justos sparsos per totum orbem. Et addimus notas; puram doctrinam evangelii et sacramenta*), although our doctrine has been thus misinterpreted on the part of Rome down to the present time (*Möhlér Symbol*, p. 347: ‘The idea of a merely invisible universally diffused society, to which we are to belong, is a barren and useless figure of the imagination and of misled feelings.’ *Döllinger, Kirche und Kirchen*, 1861, p. 26: ‘Theologians, giving up in despair the article of the one universal Church, fall back upon an abstraction, an image of the mind, the so-called invisible Church’). But it is a reality, and, indeed the highest reality.

(<sup>15</sup>) Delitzsch *Apol.*, p. 282.

(<sup>16</sup>) This is a thought frequently expressed by Guizot: *Histoire de la Civilisation en France*, i. p. 316; by *L’Eglise et la Société Chrétiennes*, 1816, p. 7-64. On the contrast of the ancient world, he says: ‘*Dans l’antiquité païenne, même sur ses plus beaux théâtres et dans ses plus beaux jours, les étrangers étaient des ennemis. A moins que des conventions particulières et précises n’eussent été conclues entre deux nations, elles se considéraient comme absolument étrangères,*

*l'une à l'autre et naturellement hostiles. A peine les plus grands esprits de l'antiquité, Aristote et Cicéron en ont, ils conçu quelque idée,* etc. Even Aristotle does not rise above the level of the ancient view, as his well known theory about slaves proves. It was only the latter stoic philosophy that had some slight presentiment of a universal society of mankind, but the idea remained a merely barren notion.

(<sup>17</sup>) Pasc., ii. 126. '*Chacun suive les mœurs de son pays.—On ne voit presque rien de juste ou d'injuste qui ne change de qualité en changeant de climat. Trois degrés d'élévation du pôle renversent toute la jurisprudence. Un méridien décide de la vérité; en peu d'années de possession, les lois fondamentales changent; le droit a ses époques. Vérité au delà des Pyrénées, erreur au delà*' (Nicolas, iii. 543).

(<sup>18</sup>) Compare Goethe's opinion on this subject, 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lect. IX., Note 22.

(<sup>19</sup>) It is a current idea to the French mind, which delights in abstract generalities, thus to represent the contrast between Romanism and Protestantism. Guizot frequently does so, and Vinet in particular ingeniously carries out this idea in his above cited work.

(<sup>20</sup>) What follows coincides especially with the representation of Martensen (*Dogmatik*, p. 26, etc.); but corroboration of each of the propositions of the text may be found also in Catholic theologians even as recent as Möhler. I refer, for the sake of brevity, to the numerous passages with which Hase has corroborated his statements, in his copious and interesting *Handbuch der Protest. Polemik gegen die röm-kath. Kirche* (2d edit., 1856, pp. 1-192). That obedience to the Bishop of Rome is necessary to salvation was declared not merely by such popes as Boniface VIII. (+ 1303: *Subesse Romano pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus esse de necessitate salutis*), but also, with reference to this declaration, by the Lateran Council under Leo X., at its eleventh sitting, in the bull: *Pastor Æternus*,

sanctioned by that Council (Gieseler *Kirchengesch.*, ii. 4, 199, etc.), wherein, among other things, it is said: '*Et cum de necessitate salutis existat, omnes Christi fideles Romano pontifici subesse, prout divinæ Scripturæ et ss. patrum testimonio edocemur ac constitutiones fel. mem. Bonif. P. VIII., quæ incipit "Unam sanctam" declaratur,*' etc.

(<sup>21</sup>) To confirm what I have said, I adduce a series of expressions in which the Pope and his power are exalted to a superhuman level. Innocent III., Lib. i., Ep. 335: '*Rom. Pontefex non puri hominis sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris.*' Ep. 326: '*Non hominis puri sed veri Dei vere Vicarius appellatur.*' To John of England, 15th August 1215: '*Quia vero nobis a domino dictum est in propheta; constitui te super gentes et regna.*'—Bonif. VIII. to Philip of France, 1302: '*Christi vicarius, Petrique successor—judex a deo vivorum ac mortuorum constitutus agnoscitur.*'—At the Lateran Council of 1516, in the ninth sitting, Antonius Puccius addressed the Pope in the words of Ps. lxxii.: '*Omnes reges terræ adorabunt te et tibi servient,*' and '*Omnes reges terræ sciunt quænam potestas tibi data sit in cælo et in terra.*' In the first sitting, the Pope was addressed as '*Vestra divina majestas,*' in the ninth as '*Simillimus deo, et qui a populis adorari debet.*' At the sixth sitting, Leo X. was called '*Leo de tribu Juda et radix David.*'—Calov., *Bibl. Illustr.* on 2 Thess. ii. 5, 6, quotes from the canon law (*canon satis dist. 96 gloss. ad extr. cum inter*): '*Dominus Deus noster.*' Franc., *Panigarola* ii. 1, calls the Pope '*Unum illum dominum de quo loquitur Paulus,*' Eph. iv.—In the books of the canonists it is repeatedly said that the Pope has '*idem cum deo consistorium, idem cum Christo tribunal.*'—Gieseler, ii. p. 229, quotes from Gerson: '*Qui aestimant Papam esse unum deum qui habet potestatem omnem in cælo et in terra.*'—Christoph. Marcellus, in an oration delivered at the fourth sitting of the Lateran Council, Dec. 10, 1512, addresses Julius II. as '*Tu alter Deus in terris.*' Gieseler again (p. 206) quotes from Gerson (an opinion which Gerson controverts): '*Sicut non est potestas nisi a deo* (Rom. xiii. 1),



*sic nec aliqua temporalis vel ecclesiastica,* etc., '*nisi a Papa in cujus femore scripsit Christus: Rex regum, dominus dominantium* (1 Tim. vi. 15). *De cujus potestate disputare instar sacrilegii est,* etc. On the occasion of the latest Vatican Council, and the efforts of the Jesuits to make it subservient to the last improvement of papal absolutism, appeared the well known, learned, and most decidedly oppositional work, '*The Pope and the Council*, by Janus, 1869.' Its authors are as yet unknown, but Döllinger of Munich had at least a share in its composition. It subjects the whole Papal system to an annihilating criticism on the ground of history. Referring my readers to the work itself, I restrict myself to a few quotations from the chapter on '*Papal Infallibility*,' p. 40. 'Taken by itself as the association of believers, clergy and bishops, the church is, according to the expression of Cardinal Cajetan, the classical theologian of the Curia, the slave (*serva*) of the Pope.' In an article of the *Civiltà*, entitled, '*The Pope the father of believers*,' it is said: 'It is not enough for the people to know that the Pope is the head of the church and of the bishops, they must also understand that their own faith, their own religious life, flows from the Pope—that he is the dispenser of the gifts of the Spirit, the bestower of the benefits which religion secures,' Janus, p. 42. 'God has gone to rest, for in His stead His ever watchful and unerring vicar rules on earth as governor of the world, as dispenser of pardons and penalties.' When Janus continues, 'We have to thank such men as Bellarmine and other Jesuits for carrying matters to such an extreme, that certain authors have bestowed upon the Pope even the title Vice-God,' the very passages cited show that there was no need of Jesuits to do this, but that it is merely the result of principle. Janus, however, rightly adds, 'there is but one step more to declaring the Pope to be an incarnation of God.' The controversy of Janus, his proof that the papal system is opposed to Scripture, based upon a tissue of fraud and deception, untrue in itself, and leading to mere mechanical externalism, is unanswerable. (*E.g.*, p. 45: To ultramontanes Rome is an ecclesiastical inquiry and address

office, or rather a standing oracle—the *Civiltà* calls the Pope *summum oraculum*—having ready to hand an infallible solution of every scientific or practical difficulty.) His own positive stand-point, however, is untenable, because a divided one. For, starting from the same præmiss of the church's infallibility, he stops half-way at the aristocracy of the bishops, instead of going on to the sovereignty of the Pope. Hence his opposition, as well as that of the entire minority in the Vatican Council—great as may be the interest we feel in it—is *a priori* a hopeless one. The results of the principle must ensue, and its logic triumph, unless we make deeper work, and both perceive and shew, as the Reformation did, the falsity of the principle itself. *Sit ut est aut non sit*, is as true of the Church of Rome as of the Jesuits; she cannot be corrected, but only reformed, and this requires a change of her essential principles.

(<sup>22</sup>) The well-known saying of Virgil (*Æn.* vi. 85), and at the same time a prediction of future times. The *Civiltà* says the same thing after its own fashion, 'As the Jews were formerly the people of God, so under the new covenant are the Romans. Their dignity is superhuman,' III. 1862, p. 11. Even in 1626, Professor Carrerio, provost of Padua, thus expressed himself, 'Italians may exalt themselves above all other nations because of the distinguished favour God has shown them, by giving them in the Pope a spiritual sovereign who has dethroned great kings and still greater emperors, and set up others in their places, a sovereign to whom the most powerful kingdoms have long paid such tribute as was never before known, and who distributes among his favourites domains so extensive that neither king nor emperor ever had so much to bestow.'

(<sup>23</sup>) It is well known that it was chiefly Gregory VII. (Hildebrand, † 1085) who maintained these notions, and carried them out to a compact and consistent system. In his epistles we read: '*Quodsi sancta sedes apostolica divinitus sibi colata principali potestate spiritualia decernens dijudicat, cur non et sæcularia?—Sicut ad mundi pulchrit-*

*udinem, oculis carneis diversis temporibus repræsentandam, solem et lunam omnibus aliis eminentiora disposuit luminaria; sic ne creatura—in erronea et mortifera traheretur pericula, providit ut apostolica et regia dignitate per diversa regeretur officia,’ etc. From the Dictatus Papæ: 9, Quod solius Papæ pedes omnes principes deosculentur: 11, Quod unicum est nomen in mundo: 12, Quod illi liceat imperatores deponere: 27, Quod a fidelitate iniquorum subjectos potest absolvere, Gieseler ii. 2, 5. And Innocent III. speaks, if possible, still more decidedly († 1216), Lib. ii. Ep. 209: ‘Dominus Petro non solum universam ecclesiam, sed totum reliquit seculum gubernandum. Lib. xvi. Ep. 131: ‘Hunc itaque reges seculi propter deum adeo venerantur, ut non reputent se rite regnare, nisi studeant ei devote servire.’ To the ambassadors of Philip: ‘Principibus datur potestas in terris, sacerdotibus autem potestas tribuitur et in cælis: Illis solummodo super corpora, istis etiam super animas. Unde quanto dignior est anima corpore, tanto dignius est etiam sacerdotium quam sit regnum.’ The famous comparison with the sun and moon, Lib. i. Ep. 401: ‘Sicut universatis conditor deus duo magna luminaria in firmamento coeli constituit, luminare majus, ut præesset diei, et luminare minus, ut nocti præesset; sic ad firmamentum universalis ecclesiæ, quæ coeli nomine nuncupatur, duas magnas instituit dignitates, majorem, quæ, quasi diebus, animabus præesset, et minorem, quæ, quasi noctibus, præesset corporibus; quæ sunt pontificalis autoritas et regalis potestas. Porro sicut luna lumen suum a sole sortitur, quæ re vera minor est illo quantitate simul et qualitate, situ pariter et effectu: sic regalis potestas ab autoritate pontificali suæ sortitur dignitatis splendorem, etc. This comparison of the papacy and the empire to the sun and moon was subsequently still more exactly carried out, and indeed so nicely computed, that the pope was declared to be one thousand seven hundred and forty-four times higher than the emperor and kings (*papam esse millies septingentiesquadrigies quater imperatore et regibus sublimiorem*), Gieseler, ii. 2, 108.*

(<sup>24</sup>) Even that most powerful of Popes, Innocent III.,

acknowledged the privileges of a general council (compare Hase, *Polemik*, p. 163); while the councils of the 15th century, at Constance and Basle, decidedly subordinated the Pope to a general council. See in *Gieseler*, ii. 4, 14, the views of Gerson, which have become a standard in this matter, e.g. '*Sed numquid tale concilium ubi papa non præsidet, est supra papam? Certe sic. Superius in auctoritate, superius in dignitate, superius in officio. Tali enim concilio ipse papa in omnibus tenetur obedire. Tale concilium jura papalia potest tollere, a tali concilio nullus potest appellare, tale concilium potest papam eligere, privare, deponere,*' etc.

(<sup>25</sup>) The opposition between the papal and episcopal systems, i.e., between the ecclesiastical absolute monarchy and the ecclesiastical aristocracy, was not indeed fully disposed of in doctrine though in practice it was decided in favour of the former till the last council (compare Hase, *Polemik*, p. 162, etc.) Even Pius II. (Æneas Sylvius, † 1464) declared appeals to a general council heretical, a declaration frequently reiterated by his successors (Hase, p. 164). One important element too, of the last new dogma, that of the *immaculata conceptio Mariæ*, consists in the fact that it was laid down by the Pope without a general council, and that it was thus a step towards complete papal plenipotence even in the authorisation of new doctrines, the protests raised against it by the Romish Church and clergy themselves being utterly ineffectual. (Compare Hase, *Polemik*, pp. 337-350; and Preuss, *Die römische Lehre von der unbefleckten Empfängniss*, etc., 1865). The papacy has since indeed taken the farther fatal step of laying down the dogma of the Pope's infallibility, and thus of definitely deciding the point so long controverted.

(<sup>26</sup>) Compare Uhlhorn's excellent lectures on the Romish Council. I adduce a few passages on the point in question. On the subject of the recent dogma of the Immaculate Conception (1854), he says, p. 57, 'The importance of this event can hardly be over-estimated. It marks a new epoch

in the history of the Church of Rome, the point at which the work of mere restoration is exchanged for that of construction. It is no longer with Tridentine but with hypertridentine Catholicism that we have to deal. This proclamation of a new dogma could only be the first step upon a new path and it is no longer the only one,' p. 58. 'The Romish Church, which the Reformation rejected, has nothing to oppose to those negative powers which are hostile to the church, but an increasingly rigorous Papal authority.' 'Hence the council, hence the chief question before the council, viz., the Infallibility of the Pope.' 'Whatever else the council may decide and effect, it will at all events enhance the contrast still more, and make it more clearly evident whether the remedy for a world increasingly alienated from Christianity is to be found in the papacy or the gospel, and whether the authority of an infallible Pope or the power of the Divine word in the foolishness of preaching the cross, and the grace of God in Christ will eventually triumph.' Uhlhorn, p. 88, rightly insists that the main question is not that of the Pope's infallibility, but whether there is any infallible ministry at all ; not till this is decided, can it be determined what is the organ of such ministry. This question, moreover, depends upon another, viz., whether tradition, *i.e.*, the Church or Scripture is to be regarded as ultimately decisive. If the former be so regarded, then (p. 47), inspiration is continued in the infallible ministry of the Church. To this are men referred when they desire to know what is the truth, etc. Hence the depreciation of Holy Scripture. 'Believers do not need the Scriptures, because they have in the infallible ministry, the ever-present living oracle which answers all questions, and compared with which Scripture is but a dead letter, an obscure and incomprehensible book, which does but mislead men to heresy, or—as the Bishop of Mayenne says—the notes of a piece of music which is not understood till performed upon the instrument, *i.e.*, till interpreted by the infallible ministry. Hence we everywhere encounter such obliteration, nay, such annihilation of the distinction between the word of Scripture and the word of the Church, between canonical and



apocryphal books. All are now canonical, and the council can confidently exalt the ascension of Mary to an article of faith, although it is only found in apocryphal writings,' etc. Now to its question: Who or what is the organ of infallible teaching? the history of the Romish Church gives two answers: the Episcopalian says: An œcumenical council; the Curialist: The Pope. 'Episcopalianism and Curialism however are not two equally authoritative opinions in the present Romish Church, but two phases of development; episcopalianism, a phase now surpassed, curialism the consistent carrying out of the whole system,' (p. 99). Episcopalianism indeed suffers also from internal incompleteness and inconsistency,' (p. 100). They are indeed extremely simple inferences and scarcely to be refuted, by which Archbishop Dechamps, the defender of infallibility, advances from the proposition 'the Church is infallible,' to the proposition 'the Pope is infallible.' He merely writes between them the proposition: the Church is monarchically constituted, therefore he who exercises sovereignty in the infallible church must himself be infallible (p. 101). I may here perhaps relate that more than twenty years ago, being in a remote Bavarian village, I engaged in theological discussion with the Roman Catholic clergyman of the place, at the inn which he seemed much to frequent. He was far removed from the movements and questions of the day, and led a solitary and retired life. With true tact, however, he encountered my maxim from Tertullian: *ubi spiritus sanctus ibi ecclesia*, with the stout Romish maxim: *ubi Papa, ibi ecclesia*. For this proposition involves the whole recent development of infallibility. 'In effect,' continues Uhlhorn, p. 102, 'Infallibility has long been claimed on the part of the Popes, and acknowledged on the part of the church, although it may never yet have been expressly declared. How else would the Tridentine council have left to the Pope the framing of the creed which is binding upon all? etc. 'I would moreover warn against the delusion of imagining that the bishops of the opposition materially approximated our church. It is still just as far from Episcopalianism to Protestantism, as from the Council of Basle to the Diet of

Worms, from the decrees of Kostnitz to the confession of Augsburg,' (p. 105). His final inference (p. 115) is: 'Decided, and faithful adherence to the protestant scriptural principle is the only right way of opposing Rome, the pure Word of God the only weapon which will lead to victory. They who turn aside therefrom, to the right hand or the left, are on the road to Rome; and they who wrest it, whether in the interest of a Puseyitish High churchmanship or of a liberalism calling itself Protestant, are labouring in the cause of Rome.'

(<sup>27</sup>) I cite from Janus certain facts in refutation of the assertion of Infallibility:—1. Innocent I. and Gelasius I. declared the Communion of children to be indispensable, and relegate to hell all children who die before its reception. 2. Julius declared the openly Sabellian doctrine of Marcellus of Ancyra to be orthodox. 3. Liberius obtained his recall from exile from the emperor Constantius only by agreeing to the condemnation of Athanasius, subscribing an Arian creed, and declaring the Nicene creed to be erroneous. At which Hilarius indignantly exclaimed, 'That is Arian perfidy! I excommunicate thee, Liberius, and thine associates. I excommunicate thee, perfidious Liberius, once, twice, and thrice.' 4. Innocent approved of the resolutions of the two African synods of Milevium and Carthage, and declared a work of Pelagius heretical. Zozimus, however, approved of the creed of Celestius, who was accused of this heresy. Not till after the African bishops, abiding by their sentence of condemnation, had addressed to him an urgent epistle, did Zozimus give in his agreement, by way of supplement, to their decisions. 5. Honorius I., at the commencement of the Monotheletic controversy, expressed himself in favour of the heresy. Pope Martin I., however, rejected Monotheletism at the Romish Synod. The sixth Œcumenical Council at Constantinople, 680, solemnly condemned Honorius, who was not defended even by the Papal legates. His doctrinal works were delivered to the flames as heretical. 6. The Tridentine Synod had declared the translation of Jerome to be the text of the Bible for the

Western Church, but there was as yet no ecclesiastically authorised edition of the Latin Bible. Sixtus V. undertook to publish one, and it appeared with the necessary anathemas and coercive measures. It was found, however, to be full of faults ; above 2000 incorrect passages, which were owing to the Pope himself, were discovered. It was said that a public prohibition of the Sixtine Bible must be issued. Bellarmine, however, advised that the great peril into which Sixtus had brought the Church should be hushed up as far as possible. Janus, in his criticism of the Papacy and its history, speaks of 'fables, falsehoods,' 'perversions,' 'errors,' 'defective institutions and conditions,' 'hereditary evils,' 'ancient and recent disfigurements,' 'oldest, old, modern, and most recent counterfeits,' etc., designates the Papacy as 'a disfiguring, morbid, and stifling excrescence on the organism of the Church,' 'as the most unhappy of individual absolutisms,' 'as the tyranny of an absolute monarch.' In such a state of affairs it is impossible to attack the infallibility of the Pope, and uphold that of the Church. Hence Frohschammer rightly says : 'In the face of this history of the Papacy, it is impossible any longer to maintain the infallibility of the Church itself. How can a church, in which all took place, in which all could take place that is related in this book, be infallible ; be, after all this, still esteemed or declared infallible ? How can a church in which, for centuries, an all-pervading system of deception and violence has prevailed be nevertheless declared to have itself remained pure and uncontaminated ? A body, whose vital organs, whose head and heart are totally corrupt, cannot have remained sound in its other members.' Compare Schick's Janus and Anti-Janus, *Erlanger Zeitschr. für Protest, und Kirche*, 1870. July, p. 7, etc.

(<sup>28</sup>) Compare Menss's work, mentioned note 25 ; also Uhlhorn's lectures on the Council, pp. 57, 77, sq.

(<sup>29</sup>) The word Protestantism is derived, as is well known, from the protest of the Protestant States against the decree of the Imperial Diet in the year 1529, which protest they,

in their appeal, grounded upon the positive principle that matters being herein involved 'which concern and touch the honour of God and the happiness and salvation of our souls, we, by God's command, and for our conscience' sake, are bound and obliged to have respect above all, to the same our Lord God;' that is, in other words, that in matters of religion and faith, not human authority, but God's Word alone, is binding and decisive. Thus the word Protestantism, far from denoting any mere negation, involves a very decided and definite affirmation.

(<sup>30</sup>) On the Protestant doctrine of the Church, compare above, Note 14, and Luther's *Lehre von der Kirche*, by *Köstlin*, 1853.

(<sup>31</sup>) Many treatises have lately been written on the principle of the Reformed Church, and the difference between it and that of the Lutheran Church (compare 'Literature' in my *Kompend. der Dogm.*, § 13). To obtain a correct impression of the proper nature of the Reformed Church, it should not be observed in Germany, where it has adopted many Lutheran elements, but in countries which are entirely of the Reformed persuasion, such as Switzerland, etc. We should then easily perceive, both that she has committed a far wider breach with historical tradition than the Lutheran Church has done, going to work in a far more radical manner, and falling back more directly upon Scripture itself, and that the doctrinal difference in her teaching concerning the means of grace, as connected with the fundamental doctrine of predestination (the absoluteness, sole causation, and sole agency of God) has not merely a theoretical, but also a very decided practical influence in the guidance of souls and the direction of the conscience.

---

#### NOTES TO LECTURE VIII.

(<sup>1</sup>) I have collected the surprisingly numerous quotations made by our Lord, in the *Sächs. Kirchen-und Schulblatt*, 1862, Nos. 24 and 25. The position which Jesus takes up

with respect to the Old Testament, and the estimation in which He holds it, may be clearly seen by the use He makes of it. He unquestionably regards the Old Testament as absolutely the Word of God.

(<sup>2</sup>) Joseph. c. Apion. i. 8 : τὰ δικαίως θεῖα πεπιστευμένα Πᾶσι δὲ σύμφυτόν ἐστιν εὐδοῦς ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γενέσεως Ἰουδαίοις τὸ νομίζειν αὐτὰ θεοῦ δόγματα, καὶ τούτοις ἐμμένειν, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, εἰ δεῖσι θνήσκειν ἡδέως.

(<sup>3</sup>) On the Gospels, compare 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture X., p. 287, etc., and Notes 5 and 6, Uhlhorn ; *Die Modernen Darstellungen*, etc., p. 69 ; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden unsre Evangelien verfasst?* 4th edition, 1866. A good and popular discussion of these and kindred questions will be found in the excellent work of Weber, *Kurzgefasste Einleitung in die heil. Schriften A. und N. Testaments*, 2nd edition, 1867, p. 192, etc.

(<sup>4</sup>) Compare Tischendorf's above named work, p. 99.

(<sup>5</sup>) Testimony to the existence of the New Testament canon in the latter half of the second century is found in Irenæus (+ 202), in the Syriac version of the New Testament, and in the so-called Muratorian Canon (about A.D. 170.) Compare Landerer's careful article on the canon of the New Testament, in Herzog's *Realencycl.* vii. 270, &c.

(<sup>6</sup>) As early as the middle of the second century canonical authority was attributed to the books of the New Testament, as may be gathered from the above named work of Landerer, p. 278. Hase, in his *Polemik*, p. 68, etc., has shown that not only in the days of a Tertullian and an Irenæus, but also in those of an Augustine and an Athanasius, the decisive authority of the Holy Scriptures was inculcated, and the members of the Church exhorted to read them, as is also stated in the work of the well-known Catholic theologian, L. Van Ess, *Chrysostomus oder Stimmen der Kirchvater über das nützliche und erbauliche Bibellesen*,



1824. Lessing's controversial writings gave occasion to a learned work on this subject, entitled: *Kritische Untersuchungen von dem Gebrauch der heil. Schrift unter den alten Christen*, 1779, by the younger Walch. Certainly the Western fathers give greater prominence to tradition than do the Greek fathers, who lay more stress upon the written word; yet the former by no means seek to impeach by this prominence the authority of Scripture, starting, as they do, from the premiss of the accordance of Scripture and tradition. When the two are found at variance, it is not for a moment questioned by such a churchman as Cyprian, that Scripture is to decide as to what is truth, and that tradition, unsupported by Scripture, is but antiquated error. And even subsequently, when in the Middle Ages the notion of tradition had expanded into the notion of Church doctrine in general, tradition was always designated as *autoritas*, but Scripture as *veritas*.

(7) So taught the schoolmen of the Middle Ages. The greatest and most respected of these, Thomas Aquinas, expressly says, that from Scripture alone can we indisputably prove, while from the authority of the fathers we can only probably infer. This certainly applies rather to theory than practice. Yet the oath upon Holy Scripture which Luther had to take, gave him also a legal right to oppose the errors of tradition in the name of Scripture.

(8) The notion of tradition has undergone a transformation. Tradition originally meant such words of Christ and of His apostles as were only orally preserved. In the course of time, the whole body of Church doctrine, as gradually developed by synods and endowed with ecclesiastical authority, was comprised in it. The modern notion, as applied by Jesuit theologians, and especially by Mohler, is that of Church consciousness under a process of development. But in all these cases the decision as to what tradition is rests with the lawful authorities of the Church.

(9) The sole authority of Scripture, as the supreme rule of

Christian doctrine and practice, and the doctrine of justification by faith alone, have generally been designated the two principles of Protestantism. These are not (as Dorner, *Das Prinzip unsrer Kirche*, etc., 1841, views it) to be understood as the distinction between 'Christian objectivity' and 'Christian subjectivity;' 'Scripture exhibits objective original Christianity;' 'the material principle is faith, by which the truth found in Scripture, in a state of privation, attains to free inward existence;' on the contrary, the justification which is by faith denotes the thing itself (the material, *i.e.*, the real principle), the essential matter of Christianity; and Scripture denotes the place where this matter is authentically, and therefore normally testified, and whence it is consequently to be obtained with infallible certainty. Hence the doctrine of justification is generally called, in the confessions of our Church, 'The crowning and fundamental article;' and in the Schmalkald Articles (ii. p. 304, 1, 3) Luther speaking of it says: 'Of this article nothing can be yielded or relaxed, though heaven and earth, and such things as will not remain, should fall. Upon this article is founded all that we teach against the Pope, the devil, and the world. Hence we must be quite certain and have no doubt about it, else all is lost, and the Pope, the devil, and all have the victory and the right over us.' Holy Scripture, moreover, is treated in the confession as the self-comprehensible rule; and this principle is most clearly expressed in the preface to the Form of Concord: *Sola sacra Scriptura judex, norma et regula, ad quam—omnia dogmata exigenda sunt et judicanda.*—An excellent defence of Scripture, and of the Protestant Scripture-principle, against the attacks of Rome, is given by Ad. Monod in his work *Lucile ou la lecture de la Bible*, 1854.

(<sup>10</sup>) *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1864, iv. p. 422. Only a few passages from the fine conclusion of the article of Alb. Reville can be given here: '*Que la bible reste donc ce qu'elle est, le monument impérissable de nos origines religieuses et le meilleur aliment de la piété réfléchie.—C'est d'elle en grande partie que procède le monde moderne.—Jamais la*

*bible n'a été l'objet d'une critique plus pénétrante et plus hardie que de nos jours, jamais son influence n'a été plus grande et sa propagation plus active.—Elle est traduite en plus de cent trente cinq langues, et comme jadis chez les Gothes d'Ulfilas, elle a créé chez plus d'un peuple l'alphabet la lecture et l'écriture.'—*

(<sup>11</sup>) Ad. Planck, in his work on Melancthon *Præceptor Germaniæ*, 1860, p. 86, etc., has called attention to the ideal of education cherished by Melancthon, viz., of the institution of Christian humanities by the union of the humanities with the Reformation. Luther's zeal for the cultivation of ancient languages often comes prominently forward in his fine addresses in 1524 to the councillors of all towns, exhorting them to institute and support Christian schools. (Works, *Erl. Edit.* xxii. 168, etc.), e.g.: 'If, then, the Gospel is dear to us, let us hold fast to the languages. For it is not in vain that God has caused His Word to be written in two languages only,' etc. 'And let us be sure of this, that we shall not be able to maintain the Gospel without the languages. The languages are the scabbard in which this sword of the spirit is placed; they are the casket in which this jewel is deposited; they are the vessel in which this beverage is contained; they are the room in which this meal is spread; and, as the Gospel itself shows, they are the basket in which are kept this bread and fish and fragments. Nay, if we were (which, God forbid!) through negligence to let go the languages, we should not only lose the Gospel, but should at last come to such a pitch as to be able neither to write nor to speak either Latin or German correctly. Let us, therefore, take warning by the dreadful example of the high schools and monasteries, in which not only has the Gospel been perverted, but the Latin and German languages have also been corrupted. The wretched people have become mere brutes; they speak and write neither German nor Latin correctly, and have almost lost their common sense.'

(<sup>12</sup>) It is acknowledged that the cause of Bible propaga-

tion has in our times gone hand in hand with the revival of Christian life, and that the one has promoted the other. In theological circles, the Epistle to the Romans, and Tholuck's commentary thereon, have become of especial importance. Nor have Bible circulation and the study of the Bible been less intimately related to the revival of religious life within the Romish Church of South Germany (Boos, Gossner, and others. Compare on this subject Thomasius, *Das Wiedererwachen des evang. Lebens in der luth. Kirche Bayerns*, 1867, p. 141.

(<sup>13</sup>) This question was agitated, especially by Lessing, and the fact that Christian faith and practice are independent of Scripture inculcated, but in an exaggerated manner, and less in the interest of the cause itself than from love of controversy (see his *Theol. Streitschriften*, x. and xi. vol., Lachmann's, edit. Compare Schwarz's *Lessing als Theologe*, 1854, p. 161, etc., and Holtzman's *Kanon und Tradition*, 1859, p. 79, etc.). Lessing's position of the priority and superiority of tradition to Scripture was repeated by Delbrück (*Philipp Melancthon der Glaubenslehrer. Eine Streitschrift*, 1826) and called forth the excellent epistles of Sach. Nitzsch and Lücke (*Ueber das Ansehen der heil. Schrift und ihr Verhältniss zur Glaubensregel in der protest. und in der alten Kirche. Drei theol. Sendschreiben*, 1827). This controversy was again taken up by Daniel in Halle (*Theol. Controversen*, 1843 :) ('They who exalt the written word of the New Testament into the supreme, or, more correctly speaking, sole source of knowledge for faith, declare it to be that which of its very nature it cannot be ; which, in conformity with the Lord's purpose, it never was to be ; which, according to its own testimony, it never will be ; which it was not esteemed to be in the first ages of the Church ; and which it has never yet been in practice.') Jacobi (*Die Kirchliche Lehre von der Tradition und der heil. Schrift*. i. 1847) and Holtzmann (*Kanon und Tradition*, 1859) then defended the spiritual principle against this Puseyism. In this question, sufficient distinction has not been made between the different degrees in which Scripture

is important and necessary to the Church as such, and to the individual Christian. To the former it is an absolute, to the latter a relative necessity.

(<sup>14</sup>) On the part of Rome, the Protestant principle concerning Scripture has ever been attacked on the ground of the supposed obscurity of Holy Scripture, and the necessity of tradition for the interpretation and determination of its meaning thence inferred. If this obscurity is proved by the varying interpretations which certain and even important passages of Scripture (*e.g.*, the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper) experience, or by the need of commentaries on Scripture, we must concede that in this respect Scripture is certainly not an umpire in a juridical sense, but that the way of attaining to and perceiving its decision is a moral way, the way of moral labour and moral obedience. And this does but correspond with the very nature of the Holy Spirit, who is not an umpire in a human sense, but is a moral spiritual power. The very premiss, moreover, of commentaries, is the clearness of Scripture, *i.e.*, the possibility of understanding it. How incapable tradition is of giving a decision, to say nothing of its internal discrepancies, is evident on the most superficial observation ; for how else can tradition prove its own truth but by a reference to its primitiveness, *i.e.*, its conformity to Scripture ? Compare on this question in general, Hase, *Polemik*, p. 68, sq.

(<sup>15</sup>) Quoted from Guizot's *Meditations*, i. 1864, p. 166.

(<sup>16</sup>) On the organism of Holy Scripture, compare my Lecture in the *Sächs. Kirchen-und Schulblatt*, 1861, Nos. 38 and 40. Compare also Auberlen, *Die göttl. Offenbarung*, i. 1861, p. 275. Weber's *Kurzgefasste Einleitung*, etc., 2d edit., 1867, contains an excellent abstract of Scripture. Standt's *Fingerzeig in den Inhalt und Zusammenhang der heil. Schrift*, 2d edit. 1859, also contains useful matter on this subject.

(<sup>17</sup>) Compare 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture X., p. 301, etc., note 22 ; and Stirn, p. 22.



(18) Holy Scripture being designed in the first place, for the Church in general, to enable her to fulfil her vocation, and only in the second place for individual Christians, we must distinguish between the certainty and experience of individuals, and of the Church with respect to it. The limits of the former are not identical with the limits of the latter. The Church verifies the truth of Scripture in her own experience, step by step, in the course of her history. Thus, *e.g.*, she found out what she possessed in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians at the Reformation, and she makes a similar experience in the course of time with respect to other portions of Scripture.

(19) Compare especially Brugsch, *Aus dem Orient*, 1864, ii. 29, etc., *Moses und die Denkmäler*. Besides the well-known picture in which are represented Egyptian taskmasters and slaves (probably Hebrews) making bricks, written communications of Egyptian scribes of the court of Rameses II. = Sesostris (who succeeded to the crown about B.C. 1400) have been found on ancient papyrus rolls, in which the Hebrews (Apura) are mentioned as employed in the quarries.

(20) Compare Niebuhr's *Geschichte Assurs und Babels*, etc., 1857, p. 274: 'The lately so much derided book of Jonah furnishes, besides other matter, a striking proof of the accuracy of Scriptural statements; its description of Nineveh being fully confirmed by modern discoveries concerning the topography of that city.' On the book of Daniel, compare Hengstenberg, *Beiträge*, i., p. 333, etc.; and Keil's *Einleitung zum A.T.*, p. 394, etc. The stone with the Moabitish inscription of the 9th century B.C., recently discovered in the region east of the Jordan, furnishes a fresh corroboration of the statements of Scripture. The Mesha, King of Moab, who speaks by this inscription, is undoubtedly the same spoken of in 2 Kings iii. 4; and the whole inscription is a testimony to the historical and geographical accuracy of the Scripture narrative. Hence, Vogué, the French investigator, calls the interesting document, *une page originale de la Bible*. Compare the account in the *Allg. Ev.-*

*Luth. Kirchenzeitung*, 1870, p. 11. One single section of Scripture, the narrative of St Paul's journey to Italy, in the Acts of the Apostles, was recently thoroughly discussed in an interesting lecture, given by Dr Arthur Breusing, Director of the School of Navigation, Bremen, and author of several nautical works,) for the benefit of the funds of the German expedition to the North Pole. In this lecture, every single particular, down to each separate numerical statement, was most strictly verified and corroborated. An account of this lecture, as given by a reporter, appeared in the *Weserzeitung* and also in the *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung*, 1870, No. 23.

(<sup>21</sup>) Stirm, p. 31. The proofs are given in the *Schneckenburger Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, 1862.

(<sup>22</sup>) Reimarus, in particular, denied the moral character of Holy Scripture and its contents, and indeed both the moral character of Jesus himself and especially of the Old Testament saints—the former in the *Wolfenbüttel* fragments published by Lessing, the latter in the *Remains* published by Schmidt, 1737.

(<sup>23</sup>) On the question of miracles, compare 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture VII., p. 193.

(<sup>24</sup>) This self-evidence of Holy Scripture is decisive for every Christian, *e.g.*, in the case of St John's Gospel. For this manifestly declares itself to be the work of an apostle, and indeed of St John, and bases upon this very circumstance the veracity of its statements, so that violence would be done to our sense of truth by this work, if its testimony concerning itself were untrue. Now what the Christian is certain of on these grounds is also scientifically confirmed to the theologian. Where, moreover, such self-testimony is absent, as *e.g.*, in the case of the Gospel of St Matthew, a Christian will feel that there are limits to the freedom of criticism. It is no article of faith, but only tradition, that this Gospel is the work of St Matthew, a tradition which

might by possibility be found erroneous. But whatever may be the result of critical investigation concerning the authorship of this Gospel and the date of its composition, the historical credibility of the work itself, can by no means be called in question thereby. This applies also in other similar cases. Compare on this subject, Ebrard in Herzog's *Realencycl.* viii. 90, and Hägenbach, *Encycl.* p. 150, etc.

(27) Compare W. Menzel, *Kritik des modernen Bewusstseins*, 1869, p. 11, 3 sq. 'There is an intimate connection between the German people and the Bible. Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans, left no other relics and has in art no other attribute than a Bible pierced by a sword, and yet uninjured in a single letter. When he was slain by the heathen Frisians, they pierced his Bible also, but the sacred book was uninjured. Into no language has the Bible been since more frequently translated, than into German ; and in no country has it been more written about and explained than in Germany. And what could be a greater glory to our nation ? For it is the book of books ; the source of eternal life, of consolation and of support to all the unhappy and tempted ; the shield and weapon of the innocent ; the awakener of the spiritually asleep ; the guide out of the labyrinth of sin ; and, finally, the condemnation of those who remain therein. A book which has no equal in the world, whose matter penetrates as deeply into every soul as the eye of God himself ; a book utterly true, wiser than all law-books, more copious than all manuals, more beautiful than all secular poems, more touching to the heart than the tones of a mother's voice ; and yet of such profundity, that the very wisest could not exhaust it, etc. Excellent testimony to the *child-like nature of the Bible*, is given by the French historian, E. Rosseuw, in the introduction prefixed to his French translation of an Alsatian work (*Legendes d'Alsace traduites de l'Allemagne, etc.*) There is in the German mind a strangely charming mixture of the naïve and the sublime, of the childlike and the profound, resulting from the honest nature of this primitive people, who have kept closer to nature than we have done, and are endowed

with an indestructible youth, which defies the lapse of ages. If there are in the world any two types of mind so oppositely constituted, that they can never understand each other, they are the French and German. One always ironical, ready to jest at itself and others ; the other sincere even to childishness (*enfantillage*), indignant at any jest contrary to its nature, and ever ready to take offence when it feels itself misunderstood. . . . I have travelled much, both in North and South, and there is one fact which I have everywhere met with : *Wherever the Bible is not made the foundation-stone of education, of society, and of every form of life, there is no literature for children, or for the people.* Look at Spain, Italy, and even France, in a word, at every country in which the Bible is not read. Nowhere is there any reading for the child, or for the labourer ! In Germany and England, on the contrary, there exists a Christian children's and popular literature, in which, as in a mirror, the national spirit is clearly reflected.

---

## NOTES TO LECTURE IX.

(<sup>1</sup>) Compare Meurer's *Leben Luthers*, p. 130.

(<sup>2</sup>) I may perhaps be allowed, in connection with this subject, to revive the remembrance my tutor Nägelsbach, whose life-thought, carried out as it is in his works on the Homeric and post-Homeric theology, was, the idea here expressed.

(<sup>3</sup>) Even Aristotle acknowledges that a formed character cannot be altered (*Eth. Nicom.* iii. 5, 14). On the similar opinion of Celsus, compare Neander, *Denkw.* i. 15. How everything was despaired of at the close of the ancient world, is shown in 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture VIII., note 21.

(<sup>4</sup>) Compare Notes 14-16, on Lecture II.

(<sup>5</sup>) Compare, on this subject, the words of Melanchthon (in

the Apology for the Confession of Augsburg), as conformable with all experience, *e.g.*, p. 66 : ' Finally, it is most foolishly and unaptly said by our opponents, that men who have incurred eternal wrath obtain forgiveness of sins through love, or *actum elicitum dilectionis* ; while yet it is impossible to love God, until the heart has by faith apprehended the forgiveness of sin. For a heart that is in distress and has a real sense of God's wrath cannot love Him, until He affords that heart relief, comforts it, and shows Himself gracious. Light and inexperienced people may indeed invent a dream of love,' etc. P. 68 : ' This same faith, then, the belief of each that Christ was given for him, alone obtains forgiveness for Christ's sake, and makes us just and righteous before God. And being true repentance, it raises our hearts above the cares of sin and death : thus we are born again thereby, and the Holy Spirit who renews the heart enters into our hearts by faith, so that we can keep God's law and truly love Him,' etc. P. 81 : ' If faith receives forgiveness of sins for the sake of its love, forgiveness of sins must ever be uncertain ; for we never love God as perfectly as we ought. Nay, we cannot love God until the heart is certain that its sins are forgiven—since no one can rightly understand or possess love until he believes that we receive forgiveness of sin through Christ, of grace alone.' P. 83 : ' When then, we are born again through faith, and know that God will be gracious to us, will be our Father and helper, we begin to fear, to love, to thank God,' etc.

(6) The whole material world is a symbol of the immaterial world ; nature a symbol of the world of mind, and of the kingdom of God (compare the parables of Jesus) ; nay, man himself a symbolic image of God. The law of the material world is beauty, and thus beauty is, as Plato defines it, the reflection of truth. Nicolas, iii. 475, justly starts from this saying, in his treatise on ' Worship and Cérémonies,' in which are many apt remarks on the relations between art and the Church, though interspersed with unjust attacks on Protestantism. But if the world of the beautiful and the symbolical is to enter into the service of the Church,



it must be the very reflection of truth, and the form which makes the nearest approach to truth is speech. The justification of symbolism lies in its being a *verbum visibile*, and in its subserving speech. It is only thus that Christianity maintains its character as an ethic religion in distinction from the æsthetic religions. What a friend Luther was to art is seen from his repeated expressions on the subject (Works, Erl. Edition iii. 280, 283, etc., and 56, 297: 'Also that I am not of opinion that the arts are to be overthrown and destroyed by the Gospel, as some bigots give out, but I should like to see the arts, and especially music, employed in the service of Him who gave and created them,' and much to the same purpose); and though he gave the preference to music, on account of its affinity to speech, he yet also highly esteemed the plastic arts, and appreciated their religious and ecclesiastical importance. On the relation of art to the Church, compare Kohn, *Kunst und Kirche* (three lectures 1865, especially p. 51, etc.); and my Lectures: *über die religiöse Malerei*, 1863: *Kirchliche Kunst*, 1864; and *Darstellungen des Schmerzes*, 1864; also Hettinger's copious festival address: *die Kunst im Christenthum*, 1867.

(7) On the symbolic character of ancient Christian art in particular, compare my Lecture, *Entwicklungsgang der relig. Malerei*, 1863, p. 5, etc.; Keigler's *Kunstgeschichte*, 4th edition, 1861, i. 221, etc.

(8) It was not till the Middle Ages (Petrus Lombardus, † 1164), that the doctrine of Seven Sacraments prevailed in the Western Church. Till then the number was a fluctuating one, because the notion of a sacrament was itself a fluctuating and varying notion. It is not, however, difficult to prove that, from the very first, Baptism and the Lord's Supper had precedence of all the other so-called sacraments. Compare Hahn, *Die Lehre v. den Sakr.* 1864; and Hase, *Polemik*, p. 350, etc.

(9) The institution of Baptism, verbally translated, reads

thus : 'Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name,' etc. . . . 'and teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you.'

(<sup>10</sup>) The symbolism in Baptism consists both in the water, which is the means of purification, and in the act of immersion or aspersion, which is a representation of washing for the purpose of complete purification.

(<sup>11</sup>) St Peter uses this expression (1 Pet. iii. 21). It includes the elements of Baptism : (1) the forgiveness of sins (*e.g.*, Acts xxii. 16) ; (2) the communication of the Holy Spirit (*e.g.*, Titus iii. 5) ; and (3) reception into communion with God in Christ (*e.g.*, Gal. iii. 27).

(<sup>12</sup>) That St Paul baptized whole households—and hence also the children who formed part of them, unless they were childless households—is seen in the Acts of the Apostles, chaps. xvi. 15, 23 ; xviii. 8 ; 1 Cor. i. 16. Origen (+ 254) bears testimony that in the Eastern Church infant baptism was of apostolic tradition, while in the Western it was universally acknowledged as the undisputed custom about the middle of the third century. Upon it depends the continuity of the Church, which is dissolved by Baptists who thus atomize the Church. The little work of Dr Lührs *Die Wiedertaüfer in Briefen an einer Mutter* 1869, is a good treatise against the Baptists.

(<sup>13</sup>) Matt. xix. 13, *sq.* ; Mark x. 13, *sq.* ; Luke xviii. 15, *sq.* Thus were the disciples taught the position occupied by children with respect to the kingdom of heaven. Baptism in Church times corresponds with the blessing then bestowed on children by the Lord Jesus.

(<sup>14</sup>) It is an indisputable fact that the Romish dogma of transubstantiation is not the doctrine of primitive Christianity, nor of ancient ecclesiastical belief, but is of comparatively modern origin. Not till after the fourth century was the way prepared—whether by the idea of the union between

the earthly and heavenly elements, as with Irenæus, or by that of the allegorical, as with Tertullian and the Alexandrian school—for the notion of transubstantiation. Even in the ninth century, when Pachasius Radbertus sought to gain ecclesiastical authority for it in the West, he encountered vehement opposition. It is equally impossible to prove that the doctrine of the bare memorial and not that—as Lessing expresses it—of the pregnant signs was primitive. For it is only from the latter that the subsequent development of the doctrine can be explained. Calvin sought to give somewhat more profundity to the Zwinglian doctrine by accepting in the Sacrament, not indeed a real presence of the body and blood of Christ, but a certain personal union of the believer with Christ, and, indeed, with the vital powers of the body of Christ in heaven. But a certain amount of hesitation and obscurity affects this doctrine, and it cannot be confirmed by Scripture.

(15) The denial of the cup to the laity, which even Pope Gelasius I. († 496) designated a sacrilege, did not begin till the twelfth century, and was then justified by scholastic subtleties.

(16) The festival of the Lord's body (*festum corporis domini*) was instituted by Urban IV., 1264, for the celebration of the perpetual miracle of transubstantiation, and revived by Clement V., 1311, after having fallen into disuse.

---

## NOTES TO LECTURE X.

(1) Schelling, *Philosophie der Offenbarung*, Works iv. p. 13. "All motion is, properly, a seeking after repose."—The idea of unceasing progress is properly, the idea of progress without an aim; now what is without aim is without meaning, hence an unceasing progress of this kind is the most cheerless and barren of notions.

(<sup>2</sup>) Compare Naville, *Das ewige Leben*, pp. 3-8. It is needless to mention the lamentations over old age, in which all ages and nations have, as it were, vied in exhausting themselves. That life is ever pointing us towards the future, has been frequently pointed out by Vinet (e.g., his before-cited work, p. 28) and Pascal. Compare, e.g., *Pasc.* ii. 44 : 'Que chacun examine ses pensées, il les trouvera toujours occupées au passé et à l'avenir. Nous ne pensons presque point au présent ; et si nous y pensons ce n'est que pour en prendre la lumière pour disposer de l'avenir. Le présent n'est jamais notre fin ; le passé et le présent sont nos moyens ; le seul avenir est notre fin. Ainsi nous ne vivons jamais, mais nous espérons de vivre, et nous disposant toujours à être heureux, il est inevitable que nous ne le soyons jamais.'

(<sup>3</sup>) Lenau, i. 124 :

'Doch ist kein Menschenleben ohne Wunden.'

(There is no human life without wounds.)

i. 208 :

'O Menschenherz was ist dein Glück ?  
Ein räthselhaft geborner,  
Und, kaum gegrüsst verlorn,  
Unwiederholter Augenblick.'

('O, human heart, what is thy happiness ? A mysteriously originating instant, lost as soon as greeted, and never repeated,' (Seneca, *De cons. ad Marc.* x. 5, *tota flebilis vita est*).

(<sup>4</sup>) On this account, it is inseparable from poetry. Naville, *Das ewige Leben*, p. 22 : 'The art of poetry does not certainly consist in sighing, and yet that would be but a poor and paltry lyre in which the string of melancholy did not frequently resound.'

(<sup>5</sup>) Naville, the above-mentioned work, p. 21. This saying maintains its truth, whether the book entitled *Ecclesiasticus* were the work of Solomon or not. Seneca, *De cons. ad Polyb.* ii. 30 : *Hominis tota vita nihil aliud quam ad mortem iter ist.* *Pasc.* ii. 18 : *Nous courons sans souci*

*dans le précipice, après que nous avons mis quelque chose devant nous pour nous empêcher de le voir.*

(<sup>6</sup>) One who was certainly an enthusiastic admirer of Madame de Staël, says : 'The annals of the world's history have, during six thousand years, presented us with no woman who, for power of imagination, universality of penetration, and an ever kindling glow of youthful feeling, can be compared with her ; and what age, what country, will be the first to produce her equal ?' It cannot be denied that hers was a mind of large calibre, and one that was ever dwelling in a world of ideal beauty. Yet when in 1817 she lay upon her death-bed, she said to her physician : '*Sauvez moi et je vous donnerai toute ma fortune, car j'ai l'horreur de la mort.*' Compare Nathusius, *Volksblatt*, 1852, No. 52. Voltaire, on his death-bed, promised his physician half his property if he could give him a respite of six months. Aristotle, too (*Eth. Nicom.*, iii. 6, 6), calls death the most fearful, because the last event. When he and the moralists of antiquity, such as Seneca, exhort to fearlessness in the presence of death, they do it on no other grounds than the necessity of death and the shortness of life. Vinet, in his above-mentioned work, p. 28, says : 'After the happiest, as well as after the most wretched of lives, it is terrible to die.' Compare the whole of this sermon of Vinet's.

(<sup>7</sup>) On the universality of the belief in immortality, compare Lüken, *De Traditionen*, etc., p. 407, etc. The Indian belief certainly rests upon pantheistic opinions. According to this, the visible world is but a declension from the higher truth and reality of spirit. Hence the spirit's proper home is in the other world, and this world is only its place of probation and purification. The soul must ever be re-entering the vortex of this world, under new forms, that after passing through various bodies, it may at last, after a long period, attain the goal of perfection which the Indian mind indeed represented as the merging of the individual life in the ocean of Divinity, as a drop is lost in the ocean (compare Lüken, 417, etc.). The doctrine of the ancient Persians, as ex-



hibited in the Zendavesta, was freer from this pantheistic feature, and therefore of a more moral character. Immediately after death, the good and evil spirits contend together for three days for the soul of the departed ; the souls of the good pass safely across the high and narrow bridge over the terrible abyss leading from this world of troubles into the happy abode of Ormuzd and the Amschaspandas (the good spirits), while the souls of the wicked fall into the place of punishment. *Egypt*, with her mummies, her pyramids, and other memorials of the dead, is still a loud-voiced witness to her own belief in immortality. All the funeral ceremonies of this land ; the judgment of the dead, at which it was decided whether the deceased should be embalmed or not ; the journey in a boat to the city of the dead, with one of which all the larger towns were provided—declared the same belief. All these were figurative representations of transactions in the other world. So indigenous was the persuasion of the soul's continued existence among this people, that the Greek historian Herodotus believed it to have originated with them (compare *Lüken*, p. 410, etc.). This faith, however, is found among nations who were entirely removed from Egyptian influence. Herodotus himself declares that it was a characteristic of the Getæ, dwelling in Thrace, to believe in the immortality of the soul. They lived and died in the joyful faith that the souls of the brave are gathered to the god of their fathers. In later times, too, Roman poets held up this people as a model to their own. (Compare Curtius, *Göttinger Festreden*, 1864, p. 150. Indeed, the whole of this discourse on the significance of the belief of immortality among the Grecians may be compared with this paragraph). The same belief is found among the *Germanic nations* of the north, concerning whose religion the *Edda* gives us information. Only the brave who have fallen in battle are privileged by this warlike race to enter the Walhalla, the abode of Odin, to lead there a superior kind of earthly life ; the rest are consigned to the gloomy abode of Hel. It was the hope of the Walhalla which gave to the Cimbri and Teutones the death-defying courage with which they encountered the

Romans. Even in China and the nations of the New World, we find this faith consciously embraced and adhered to, and that not merely as an opinion, but as a power influential in the present life. It was equally prevalent among the Greeks and Romans (see especially Curtius' above-named work). The Greeks form a decided contrast to the Indians. With the former, this world is everything, and the visible the full expression of the whole inner life. This is especially evident among Homer's Greeks. With them it is this life which is the true life; the life to come a world of dread, Hades, the most hated of the Gods, souls descend sorrowing to him. Achilles wishes rather to be a day labourer in the light of the sun than a king among the shades 'who pass a colourless existence without strength—a dull monotony.' Yet even among them other notions of the life to come existed in the consciousness of the people, which, though repressed, were not to be extinguished. This was especially the case with those poets who were connected with Delphi, as Hesiod and others. A more serious view of life, a sense of its sorrow, of the need of reconciliation with the Deity, and of the relation of the present to the future life, prevail among them. And this was not mere priest-lore or mystery, but a popular conviction, whose extreme antiquity is testified by Aristotle in *Eudemos*, and is supported by a series of facts. For history presents us with examples, not merely of gloomy resignation, but also of cheerfulness in death; and that not only in the case of such moral magnates as Socrates, but also in that of men of far less moral worth. Equally do art, poetry, the sacredness of the laws relating to the dead, and the honour paid to the departed, bear testimony to this belief. The laws which prescribe duties to the dead were indeed unwritten, but they were supposed to be derived directly from the Gods; and Antigone, for the sake of fulfilling such a duty, scruples not to disobey the contrary law of the ruler, and to incur the punishment he threatens: 'Death for such a deed is honourable. Then shall I, a pious criminal, who have piously committed a crime, rest peacefully near him who loves me. I shall need favour among the dead for a longer

time than among the living. For there I shall find an eternal abode. As for thee, continue to despise, if thou wilt, the sacred law of the gods,' (Soph. *Antig.*, v., pp. 71-77). It is true that in public life this faith retired from observation, and that it was shaken by the sophists. But it took refuge in the mysteries which gathered a kind of religious fraternity around the belief in immortality, and sought to guarantee it by sacred transactions, thus affording to moral and religious consciousness that satisfaction which the public exercises of religion did not offer. Among the *Romans*, the belief in immortality did not disappear till the time of Cæsar and Cicero. Cicero confirms its antiquity, *Lael. de amic.*, iv.: '*Neque enim assentior iis, quis hæc nuper disserere cœperunt, cum corporibus simul animos interiere atque omnia morte deleri. Plus apud me antiquorum autoritas valet—vel nostrorum majorum, qui mortuis tam religiosa jura tribuerunt, quod non fecissent profecto, si nihil ad eos pertinere arbitrarentur—vel eorum qui in hac terra fuerunt Magnamque Græciam institutis et præceptis suis erudierunt,*' etc. So that Cicero was as justified in speaking of a '*consensus gentium*' to this belief, as to the belief in the existence of God.—*Tusc.* i. 16: '*Ut deos esse natura opinamur, qualesque rint ratione cognoscimus, sic permanere animos arbitramur consensu omnium nationum.*'

(<sup>8</sup>) The Appian road, with its monuments, is a proof of this. Compare the before cited passage: *Cic. Lael. de amic.*, 4.

(<sup>9</sup>) Pascal, ii, 18: '*Il importe à toute la vie de savoir si l'ame est mortelle ou immortelle.*' Also, Nicolas, i. 109; and compare the whole of this excellent paragraph.

(<sup>10</sup>) A good discussion of the special proofs, as well as of the whole question, will be found in Huber's *Die Idee der Unsterblichkeit*, Munich, 2d edit. 1865. The proofs are usually divided into historical ('*consensus gentium*'), metaphysical or ontological (from the immateri-

ality of the soul), teleological (from the powers and capacity of the soul), and moral (from the disproportion between virtue and fortune). Compare Kahnis, *Luther. Dogmatik*, i. pp. 179-194, where the literature of the subject is also given.

(<sup>11</sup>) Compare the fine discussion on the immortality of the soul, and the moral importance of this belief, in Matthias Claudius, v. 2., etc.

(<sup>12</sup>) What follows is for the most part in accordance with Martensen's *Dogmatik*, p. 430, etc.

(<sup>13</sup>) The resurrection of the body was specially alien to Greek opinion, as is evident from the derision encountered by St Paul at Athens (Acts xvii. 18 and 32), and from the doubts of the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. xv. 12) ; hence it is a subject frequently dwelt upon and discussed by ancient Christian apologists. They were wont to prove it not merely from the analogies of nature (from the seed, *Theoph. ad Antol.*, c. 18) and from the destiny of man, but, above all, from a moral point of view—from the necessity of a future judgment, and the moral significance of this corporeal life. So, e.g., *Athenag. legat.* c. 29, who believes indeed that if all is over with this life, man may wallow in crimes ; but not so if he has a hope of resurrection. Or Justin, *de resurr. extr.* : ' Why should we not allow our body all the pleasures of sense if it has not this hope, just as physicians at last allow everything to a patient of whom they have no hope ? The very purpose for which God seeks to withdraw our body from sinful pleasures, is that He has determined to reserve it for something better.' And so also in the writings of many others.

(<sup>14</sup>) Compare on what follows my *Lehre von den letzten Dingen*, 1870. I cannot, however, refrain from reminding that the doctrine of the last things presupposes the knowledge and understanding of other branches of Christian doctrine, and without these, may easily perplex the mind ;

also, that the Revelation of St John is the last and not the first book of Holy Scripture.

(<sup>15</sup>) On the results of missionary labours hitherto, (especially in India) Caldwell, one of the principal English missionaries in Southern India, says, in *Mission Work*, March 1867, that though the external results are as yet nothing in comparison with what still remains to be done, yet the indirect agency, the shaking and undermining of the whole system of heathenism, the intellectual and moral influences, may not be lightly esteemed. Compare the extract from his very interesting article in the *Leipsic Ev. luth. Missionsblatt*, 1867, No. 8. On this subject in general, I cannot omit mentioning that the great importance of missions, not only in a religious point of view, but in their bearing on the advance of civilisation, is in general greatly underrated—at least among us in Germany; for in England these seem more adequately appreciated. I freely concede that a certain pietistic and partially unsound manner of treating this subject must bear a part; but only a very small part of the blame for this unmerited depreciation. That the subject of missions demands and is compatible with the very highest mode of treatment, has been shown by Graul, whose great merit as a theologian consists herein. Compare my article upon him in Herzog's *Theol. Realencl.* xix. 578, etc.; and Hermann's *Dr A. Graul, und seine Bedeutung für die luther. Mission*, 1867. Missions, apart from their moral and religious work, which is itself a civilising influence, and that in the most eminent degree, stand in the closest connection and mutual relation with religious history, literature, philology, and geography (compare Livingstone, Petermann of Gotha, and the *Missionary Atlas*, lately published there, by Gündemann.) The Bible is at present translated into two hundred languages; and of these translations, one hundred and eighty are the works of missionaries. Most of these languages first became written languages, and were thereby preserved from entirely dying out, and brought into connection with general intellectual life, by means of these translations of the Scriptures. This fact alone would suf-



vice to prove the great importance of missions with regard to culture in general.

(<sup>16</sup>) Von Schweizer's book, *Zeitgeist und Christenthum*, which I have described in 'Lectures on Fundamental Truths,' Lecture I., Note 9, is a harbinger of such a future, and a programme of the party to whom, according to their own persuasions, the future belongs.

(<sup>17</sup>) I have here touched but slightly upon the doctrine of the so-called millennial kingdom, as being still too little established and generally admitted. It is more precisely defined in my above-mentioned work. *Die Lehre von den letzten Dingen*.

(<sup>18</sup>) Pressensé, *Jesus Christ*, etc., p. 436. Also *Martensen*, p. 438.

(<sup>19</sup>) The eternity of punishment is the special point against which so many objections and scruples have been entertained ; but as Nicolas, ii. 476, rightly observes : 'Eternity is a necessary element of the idea of perdition. For a temporary perdition, to be followed by salvation, ceases to be perdition. The eternity to follow would entirely obliterate it from the mind. Much as our feelings may revolt against it, it is not merely the unmistakable doctrine of Scripture, but also a requirement of the reason. For no one is lost who is not in union with sin. Such a one, however, has excluded himself in his inmost nature from communion with God. For him the love of God has played its part, and has yielded to power. But he who has withstood love will never be converted by power. Every moral development attains its climax either in heaven or hell. The two goals, because the two possibilities, are to be saved or to be lost. And there is a point at which, it is no longer possible to will otherwise.' On the misery of being alone with one's self, compare Vinet, p. 29.

(<sup>20</sup>) Compare Vinet's fine passage, p. 19, which I had

here in view—I conclude with the famous conversation of Augustine with his mother on the day of her death, preserved in his *Confessions*, ix. 10, (compare Naville, *Das ewige Leben*, p. 199, etc.): ‘As the day declined on which my mother—unexpectedly to us—was to depart this life, she and I were standing alone leaning against a window overlooking the garden of the house in which we were lodging, by the harbour of Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber, and where, after the fatigue of our long journey, we were awaiting the time for sailing. We were alone ; and entirely losing sight of the past in our pleasant conversation, we were looking forward to the future, and talking together of that eternal life of the saints, which no eye has seen, nor ear heard of, nor heart of man conceived. Our conversation led us to contemplate the fact, that no delights of sense are worthy to be compared with the fulness of joy of that life, nor even worthy to be named in speaking of it, and upborne by our ardent longings after that eternal life, we wandered step by step, first through this world of our earthly bodies, then to heaven itself, whence sun, moon, and stars cast their light upon the earth. And still higher did our inmost thoughts ascend in our discourse, and in our admiration of Thy works, O Lord, even to the contemplation of our own souls, and above them to that world of inexhaustible blessings, where Thou dost eternally feed Thy people with truth, where dwells that Wisdom by which all is created, that either is, or was, or will be ; and which yet did not itself begin to be, but ever is what it was and will be. And while we were thus speaking, and in our desires reaching after it, our hearts’ whole feeling came in contact with it for a few moments ; then with sighs we left the firstlings of spirit and returned to the sound of voice to speech, which begins and ends. And thus we spoke : If the tumult of the flesh were silent in the soul ; if all the forms of earth, air, and water were silent ; if the poles of heaven were silent ; and if the soul were silent within itself ; if it could forget and soar above itself ; if dreams and the fancies of the mind were silent ; if all speech, all signs, and whatever surpasses

all these were silent ; for to him who chooses to hear, all these things are saying : We did not make ourselves ; but He who inhabiteth eternity, made us—if having said this they then became silent, because they were wholly engrossed in listening to Him who made them ; and, if He alone were to speak so that we might hear His voice—to speak not by things but by Himself, not by the tongues of men or angels, not by the sound of thunder, nor by similitudes ; but, if as now we rise in spirit towards him, and have by the soaring of the mind, come in contact with that eternal wisdom which is above all things—we could hear only Himself whom we love in all these things ; and if this would endure and all lower forms would vanish, and this one Being should alone so ravish the observer, and so wholly absorb and cover him with inward joy, that this should be an eternal life, as it is now a single moment of the knowledge for which we long, would not this be the realisation of the saying : ‘ Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord ? But when will this be ? ’ Thus did we then converse ; and if not in these very words, still, O Lord, thou knowest how despicable the world and its joys appeared to us. Then said she, ‘ As for me, my son, this life has no more joy for me. What more have I to do here ? and why am I here since the hope of my life is fulfilled ? There was but one thing for which I desired to tarry yet awhile in this life, and that was to see thee a true Christian before my death. God has granted me much more, even to see thee, as his servant, contemning all earthly good. What more have I to do here ? ’

## INDEX OF PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS.

---

- Acts of the Apostles, origin of, 236  
 Aeschylus, Prometheus of, 150  
 Angels, their Nature and Office, 59  
 Angelo Michael, 81, quoted, 352  
 Apostasy, the great final, and the last form of sin, 305, 306  
 Aristotle quoted, 152  
 Art cannot take the place of religion, 81; the history of Christian, compared with the course of Christian doctrine, 128; the highest aim of, 129  
 Athanasius, 219  
 Augustine, St., 183  
 Baptism, the Sacrament of, 282, 283; Infant, 284  
 Baronius, Cardinal, quoted, 254  
 Beza, Theodore, quoted, 197  
 Bible, the, its literary worth, 242-245; the history of salvation, 251; periods and authors of the several books of, 258; question of authorship not a question of faith, 259  
 Buddhism, its origin, 44; its fundamental idea foreshadows the church, 209; its doctrine of atonement, 82  
 Cartesius, his opinion as to the certainty of the existence of God, 38  
 Catholicism (Roman) its system, 214-216; logical and consistent, 217; devoid of truth, 218; condemned by a threefold contradiction, 218; difference between, and Protestantism, 213  
 Christ, heathen presentiment of, 122; pictures of, 128-129; death of, 160-165  
 Christianity, the most influential of all historical facts, 19, 178, 200; the absolute religion, 20; Jesus Christ the matter and central point of, 28, 29, 316; its nature the fact of atonement through the death of Christ, 28, 146; its nature according to the Western Church, 30; according to Rationalism, 26; according to Protestantism, 27; according to recent speculative philosophy, 26; its relation to heathenism, 21, 31, 146; to Judaism, 24, 146; is to be the universal religion, 176, 304  
 Church, the, the work of the Holy Ghost, 195; a fact, 196; its antiquity, *Ibid.*, its triumphs, 196-198; antipathy to the, 198-203; a necessary intellectual and moral institution, 202, 203; charge of intolerance against, 202; her declarations exclusive, 203; relation to the State, 206; nature of, 207; unity of, 207-210; an indispensable necessity to the world, 210; its religious office, *Ibid.*, separated into the churches, 212; office of, differently viewed by Catholicism and Protestantism, 212 *sq.*; doctrine of in the system of Catholicism, 215; the Protestant doctrine of its twofold aspect, 224-227; the difference between the Romish, Reformed, and Lutheran Churches, 228-232: the communion of believers, 233; The O. T. transmitted by the Jews to the Christian, 235; testimony of, to the Inspiration of Scripture, 256; its means of grace, 263-290; the future of, 303  
 Condemnation, eternal, 310  
 Confirmation, baptism, followed by, 286  
 Conscience, God's witness in man, 100; asserts man's responsibility,

- 73; liberty of, a fruit of Christianity, 203
- Contradiction between Christ's nature and His reality, 133; Copernicus, 90
- Creation, acknowledgment of, a religious need, 23; its purpose a loving one, 91
- Crime, the constant enemy of society, 48; indifference to truth a, 205
- Criticism, its explanation of Christianity, 167; futility of its attacks upon the matter of Holy Scripture, 257; its inferences do not affect the essential matters of faith, 259; the present the age of, 257
- Cross, the, 161; the Church's point of union, 211; the paradox of its use, 164
- Crucifix, ancient, found in Rome, 163
- Crucifixion, punishment of, 160
- Culture, its roots in the past, 242; unable to free from sin, 80; the Church the noblest instrument of, 200
- Death connected with sin, 48; dominion of in nature and history, 45
- Deity, the, deficiency in the opinions of heathen philosophy concerning, 23
- Divine Nature, the Trinity of, 188
- Dogma, the Christ of, 107
- Dogmatists' notions of the Greek, 30
- Deism acquainted with only the barren unity of God; its position towards Pantheism, 189
- Doubt allied with intolerance, 203
- Dying not a single act but a process, 46
- Ebionites, the, denied the deity of Christ, 118
- Education, history the, of the human race, 270.
- Epistles, the, origin of, 236
- Errors regarding the God-Man, 127
- Eternal perfection, 313-316
- Evil, a universal fact in human nature, 44
- Experience, faith founded on, 36
- Eusebius referred to in confirmation of worship being offered to Christ, 118
- Faith, its position in Christianity, 32; founded neither on the doctrine of the Church nor the letter of Scripture, but on the Person of Christ, 33; demands and possesses certainty, 32, 35; its certainty, religious certainty, and founded on experience, 35, 36; its relation to knowledge, 37; its position with regard to Biblical criticism, 257-261
- Fall, the, Scripture account of, 52, 56; its consequence is the universal dominion of sin, 63
- Frederick II., quoted, 258
- Freedom essential to human nature, 52; does not abolish Divine guidance, 72
- French scholars, modern, efforts of to show the connection between the progress of society and religion, 199
- Feuerbach, 83
- Freiligrath, 82
- Gethsemane, Jesus in, 156
- God, seeking Him, the origin of all religion, 21; the religious craving impels men to seek Him, 22; not known to the heathen, 23; certainty of His existence, 37; known only in proportion as He is believed in, 40; His will the limit of man's thought, 90; His love the purpose of creation, 91; a God that hideth Himself, 93, 99; a God of patience, 95; recognises man's freedom; 98; all experience His secret influences, 100; the self-sufficient and self-blessed, 125; cannot unconditionally pardon, 149; His wrath the consequence of sin, 154; the absolutely Holy One, 155; His Triune revelation, 186, 187; His purpose in redemption, 266; final union of His people, 315.
- God-man, the question of, 107; His sinlessness, 109-111; necessity of, 119-125; possibility of, 125, 126; reality of, 126-128; errors of men concerning, 129
- Goethe, quoted, 250
- Gospel, The, the whole truth, 32; St John's, Christ's Life as depicted in, 116; found in the Old Testament, 271; is Jesus Christ, 275
- Gospels, origin of the, 236; the three



- first depict Christ especially as the Lord of mankind, 115
- Grace, forgiving and atoning, needed by all, 84-90; the highest attribute of royalty to exercise, 86; does not dishonour but exalt man, 88; St Paul pre-eminently the preacher of, 89; certainty of, 91-96; universality of, 97-100; its operations secret, 100-102; education for, 102-105; the Church's means of, 263-290
- Grace and sin, the two great facts of Christian doctrine, 43
- Greece and Rome, intellectual culture derived from, 242
- Greek Church, the, the teachers of, 91
- Greek thought, system of, 23
- Happiness is comfort, 78
- Harmony of Scripture, 255
- Heathen, The, their presentiment of a Divine Redeemer, 122; of His supernatural birth, 112
- Heathenism, the seeking religion, 24; is polytheism, but with a touch of monotheism, 22; knows neither the Creator nor the Holy God, 23
- Hegel, his notions of the nature of Christianity, 27; of the origin of sin, 51; of Christ, 128; of the doctrine of the Trinity, 181
- History, the course of, one of constant advance, 79; the Christ of, different from the Christ of rationalism, 119; Christ's resurrection, a question of, not of philosophy, 168; the Divine education of the human race, 270; the judgment of the world, 309; its final form according to prophecy, 307; its goal, 245.
- Holy Spirit, His work before Christ, His part in the work of Christ, 177-180; the Church the first work of, 193; the possession of the, the essential ingredient of the Church, 208
- Heine quoted, 65
- Heracitus, 44, 249
- Homer, 21
- Honorius (Pope), 219
- Horace, 87
- Hug quoted, 260
- Humanity, true, cannot exist without God, 68
- Human sacrifices offered as an atonement for sin, 24, 146
- Humboldt, 92.
- Immaculate Conception, dogma of, opposed by Scripture and tradition, 219
- Immortality of the soul, belief in everywhere prevalent, 294; a necessary idea, 295; proofs of, 296
- Incarnation of the Son of God, 120; possibility of the, 125
- Indian notions of the Deity, 23, 185
- Infant Baptism, 284
- Inspiration of Scripture, 48, 254; testimony of the Church to the, 256; its nature, 253; its certainty, 254
- Irenæus, 238, 246
- Israel the nation of hope, 25; their future conversion to Christ, 304
- Jacobi, his notions of the origin of sin, 51
- Jeremiah, the great prediction of, 26
- Jesus Christ, the realization of Israel's hope, 26, 115, 147; His position with respect to Christianity, 29, 143, 175, 316; the revelation of the holy love of God, and therefore the truth, 141; His person of religious importance to faith, 32; *His mediatorial personality*: true man and yet without sin, 107-111; His temptation, 107, 139; His miraculous birth, 111; is the Son of God and worshipped as God, 117; is the Son of Man, 114; is the God-man, 126; required as such by the atonement, 125; Doctrine of His self-renunciation, 130; contrasts in His manifestations, 133, 226; *His mediatorial work*: His inner development till His baptism, 137; His baptism, 137; His three offices, 136; *His prophetic* office and preaching, 140; His rejection, 145; *His High-priestly* office, 147; His last hours, 156; His death a sacrifice for sin, 146; possibility and necessity of His vicarious sacrifice to atone for sin, 146-156; His *kingly* office, 166; His resurrection and its certainty, 167; His exaltation, 174; His comprehensive designation the

- Word, 266 ; Lord of mankind, 115 ; His return, 308
- Jews, their respect for Scripture, 235 ; their ultimate conversion, 304
- Josephus, 235
- Judaism, the hoping religion, 25
- Judgment, the last, 308-310
- Justification by faith, doctrine of, 276-280 ; its ethical and psychological truth, 276
- John, St., Gospel of, its origin and aim, 236 ; portrays Christ, especially in His relation to God, 116, 130
- John the Baptist, His office, 138
- Juvenal, 75
- Kant's morality, 70
- Knowledge and Faith, 37-42
- Knowledge limited, 41 ; its relation to faith, 37, 183
- Language inadequate to express divine relations, 188
- Last things, the, 291-313
- Last judgment, 308-310
- Law, through law to liberty, 270 ; needful, 271 ; a necessary stage of moral development, 273 ; as a Divine means of education, 271 ; its aim to make men feel their need of the gospel, 274
- Leibnitz, his doctrine of the best world, 45
- Lenau, experience of, referred to in illustration of the impotence of nature, 80
- Liberty and authority, 213
- Life, sorrow and misery of, 44 ; the light of, not happiness, but comfort, 78 ; vanity of, 292 ; the earthly decides the eternal, 300
- Lord's Supper, its institution, 286 ; its nature and object, 289 ; Lutheran and Reformed doctrine of the, 287
- Liberius (Pope), 219
- Love is true morality, 70-88 ; the love of God the thought of creation, 91
- Luke's, St., Gospel, its origin and aim, 236
- Luther quoted, 246, 250, 253, 276, 286 ; his translation of the Bible, 261
- Lutheran Church, its fundamental doctrine, 276 ; its view of the Church, with regard to the views of the Reformed and Romish Churches, 230
- Man, at no time or place found without religion, 21 ; unable to deliver himself from sin and suffering, 80 ; a unity, 83 ; his highest aim communion with God, 85 ; honoured by owning his faults, 89 ; free in his moral resolves, 99, 100 ; influenced by moral forces, 101 ; made for society, 206 ; truth his supreme want, 214 ; Scripture not the work of, 252 ; his inward discord, 274 ; his destiny and faith in immortality, 297 ; his relation to the angelic world, 60
- Mass, Romish, not found in Scripture, 251
- Means of grace, 261-290
- Mark, St, Gospel of, its origin and purpose, 236
- Mary, Virgin, her relation to Christ, 112
- Materialism, sensuousness, the soul of, 58
- Matthew, St, Gospel of, its origin and aim, 236
- Melancthon on the mystery of the Trinity, 182
- Mental activity, human, the inspiration of Scripture does not exclude, 253
- Mental life, analogies of human, used to explain the Trinity, 191
- Missions, the preaching of the Word the power of, 267
- Missions, foreign, 202
- Mission, the inner, 47
- Mohamedanism, 304 ; results in Pantheism, 189
- Morality of the ancient world, 273, 274, the doctrine of justification by faith not prejudicial to, 277
- Nature under the fact of the universality of evil, 44 ; full of strife, 44 ; its relation to the angelic world, 60 ; its relation to morality, 71 ; impotent to deliver men from suffering, 80 ; Trinity of the Divine, 188
- New Testament Scriptures, origin, purpose, and collection of, 235-238 ; added to the old, 238 ; autho-

- rity attributed to, in the earliest times, 239; assert the inspiration of the Old, 252
- Obscurity of Scripture, 249
- Old Testament Scriptures regarded as the Word of God by Jesus, His apostles, and the early Church, 234; transmitted by the Jews to the Christian Church, 235; the the Gospel found in the, 271
- Pantheism, pride, the soul of, 58; its position with regard to Deism and the Doctrine of the Trinity, 189
- Pascal quoted, 198.
- Pardon, nothing but, can annul past transgressions, 84; God cannot unconditionally, 149
- Passover, Christ's last, 286
- Paul, St., his conversion and testimony to the resurrection of Christ, 172
- Pauline Epistles, the, 237
- Perdition and Salvation, 311
- Perfection, the end of history, 291; eternal, 313-317
- Philosophy, the, of the Vedas, 44; the aim of ancient, 80; the view of modern, concerning Christ and Christianity, 26, 127, 128
- Pictures of Christ, 128
- Pius IX., 218, 219
- Platen, 76, 81
- Plato, his testimony to the soul's aspiration after a better state, 53; his ideal of the true and good, 273; his presentiment of Trinity, 186
- Pliny's Epistle to Trajan, referred to, 118
- Plutarch, quoted, 75
- Poetry full of the sorrows of life, 47; testifies to the unhappiness of man, the consequence of sin, 65; ever speaks of guilt, 75
- Predestination, absolute, at variance with the universality of grace, 97
- Poverty of spirit the condition for the reception of grace, 103
- Preaching the special form of the word, the power of, 268; Jesus Christ the substance of Christian, 275
- Prophecy, tenor of, regarding the future of the Church, 303, 304
- Protestantism, its two principles, 241; its nature and its view of Christianity, 220; its doctrine of the Church, 221; its essential difference from (Roman) Catholicism, 213; view of modern so-called, of Christianity, 27
- Proudhon's social system, 47
- Puritanism mistakes human nature, 280
- Pythagorean circle of Friendship a presentient anticipation of the Church, 209
- Question of authorship not a question of faith, 259
- Questions of the day, Christ and Scripture the leading, 241
- Quinet Edgar, quoted, 200
- Rationalism, the soul of, unbelief, 58; its assertion that sin is a necessary product of our sensuous nature, 50; that Christ is only the ideal of virtue, 118; its explanation of Christ's resurrection, 170; its rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity, 181; its denial of the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, 195; its view of the nature of Christianity, 26; regards Christ as the religious genius, 119; its doctrine of justification, 276
- Reformation, the, arose from the craving after assurance of salvation, 31
- Reformed Church, its one-sided view of the Church, 229; its doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 287
- Religion a concern of universal man, 21; rests upon facts, 28; its origin man's natural seeking after God, 21; its nature, 22; its chief element man's reconciliation with God, 147; natural, has no existence but in books, 28; Christianity the absolute, 20; the universal, 304
- Religions Polytheistic, 22; difference between prae-Christian and Christian, 281
- Resurrection, Christ's, the foundation of Christianity, 167; denied on doctrinal grounds, 167; on philosophic grounds, 168; certain on historical and internal grounds, 168, 174; of the body, 301

- Renville, quoted, as to the importance of the Bible, 244  
 Romans, Epistle to the, value of, 246  
 Romish Church, its one-sided view of the Church, 228 ; its doctrine of faith, 32 ; its doctrine of justification, 276 ; its doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 287 ; its assumptions, 219  
 Rousseau, 54, 64  
 Revelation, its history a history of grace, 96  
 Sacraments, the, their nature, 280-282 ; their number, 282  
 Sacrifice, the fundamental principle of all religions, 146 ; Christ's necessary, 147  
 Sacrifices, human, founded on a true feeling, 24 ; all religions have, 146 ; their purpose atoning, 146  
 Salvation, history of, 179 ; Scripture not necessary to, conceivable, 246 ; and perdition, 310  
 Satan, the doctrine of the existence of, and of evil spirits, 58 ; motives of its rejection, 59  
 Scepticism, intolerance of, 204  
 Schefer, Leopold, quoted, 82  
 Schelling and Hegel, their notions concerning Christianity, 27  
 Schiller, error of, on man's freedom, 52  
 Schleiermacher's view of Christ's resurrection, 170 ; critical errors of, 259  
 Schopenhauer's philosophy, 45.  
 Scripture, Holy, 234 ; Jesus Christ the subject of, 235 ; the remedy for the corruption of tradition, 239 ; its intellectual importance, 242 ; its religious importance, 245 ; its necessity to individual Christians and to the Church, 246 ; its matter, 248 ; the understanding of, 249 ; conditions of understanding, 250 ; its inspiration, 251-257 ; objections to the matter of, 258 ; its predictions of the future of the Church and of the latter days, 303-317  
 Soul, immortality of, belief in, universal, 294 ; proofs of the, 296 ; state of, after death, 298  
 Speech, importance of, 265  
 Spinoza's pantheistic doctrine combated, 82  
 Statistics do not do away with sin, 71  
 Strauss, his criticism of the older rationalistic view of Christianity, 170  
 Substitution, a universal notion of man's moral consciousness, 150 ; its possibility and reality, 151  
 Suffering and Sorrow, universality of, 45-48 ; vanity of human remedies for, 80-83  
 Susceptibility, a necessary ingredient for comprehending Scripture, 250  
 Symbols, no religion without, 280  
 Self-renunciation of Christ, doctrine of, 131  
 Self-control not deliverance from sin, 70  
 Self-deliverance, no such thing as, 83  
 Sin, the most potent fact on earth, 28 ; a universal power, 49 ; arises not from sensuousness nor from our finite nature, nor from necessity, 50-52 ; is the abuse of freedom, 55-63 ; its consequences, 63 ; its nature, 66 ; is guilt, 71 ; deliverance from, needed, 80 ; requires atonement, 120 ; a transgression against God, 83 ; no good work can annul committed, 84 ; expiated only by suffering, 149 ; the resurrection a proof of its having been forgiven, 174 ; law not a remedy against, 272 ; forgiveness of, 278 ; the contradiction of contradictions, 316  
 Socialism founded on the reality of human woe, 47  
 Society at war with crime, 48 ; man made for, 206, 249  
 Socrates, greatness of, 103, quoted 249  
 Sophocles quoted, 150  
 Tacitus, 68, 75  
 Taste, objections of, to the matter of Holy Scripture, 258  
 Tertullian, 238  
 Testament, Old, the religion of, the religion of hope, 25 ; the Holy Spirit spoken of in the, 177  
 Testaments, New and Old, contrasted, 270  
 Testimony of the Church to the inspiration of Scripture, 256  
 Things, the last, 291-317

- Toleration the triumph of modern times, 202
- Tradition, its original and extended meaning, and its relation to Scripture, 238, 251
- Trinity, the, confession of, a confession of the God of salvation, 180; meaning of, 181; not a mystery for scholars, but the faith of Christians, 184; denial of, a denial of redemption, 193; the chief fundamental dogma of Christianity, 181; based not upon human knowledge, but upon the revelation of God in Christ, 186; the expression of our faith in the Redeemer, and to be understood by starting from Him, 187; attempts to explain it by the analogy of the human mind, 191; its relation to Pantheism and Deism, 189
- Triune God, the, revelation of, 180; the God of Christians, 193; the Church's belief in, 211
- Truth, the, is manifested in Christ, 142; is of its very nature exclusive, 205
- Tübingen, school of criticism, 260
- Time does not bring comfort, 79
- Unity of Scripture, 254
- Universal religion, Christianity the, 304
- Vedas, the, their subject the fact of sorrow, 44
- Virgin Mary, her humility, 90
- Visions, belief in, the resurrection of Christ attributed to, 172
- Western Church, its view of the nature of Christianity, 30
- Will, man's free, and entails responsibility, 71, 98; incapable of attaining to true morality, 68
- World, the eternal, understood only according to its own laws, 38; this, a world of woe, 65; its final preparation, 309, 314
- Word, the, the form of mind and of the revelation of God, 265; a means of grace, 264; its importance to the Church and its form therein, 266; its matter, 269; its aim, 280; is an expression used to designate Jesus Christ, 266

















Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01010 2897